The Nation

Vol. CIII NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1916 No. 2684

Summary of the News

The most interesting news of the week in international affairs is the maturing of the long-threatened political crisis in England. Official announcement was made on Sunday of the impending reconstruction of the Cabinet, and was confirmed by Mr. Asquith's statement in the House of Commons on Monday, when the House adjourned until to-day (Thursday). Despite all rumors to the contrary, and the persistent hounding of the Northcliffe press, it seems probable, as we write, that Mr. Asquith will remain Premier. Among the conflicting reports, the one clear statement is that of the Prime Minister, who announces the impending reconstruction, "with a view to the most effective prosecution of the war." The general opinion in England seems to be that this will be secured by the re-making of the War Council into a small body of only four or five members, with increased powers and opportunity to devote themselves wholly to the conduct of the war.

The contemplated general reconstruction was foreshadowed by the announcement on November 29 of changes at the Admiralty. Admiral Sir John R. Jellicoe becomes First Sea Lord, in succession to Admiral Sir Henry L. Jackson, who is appointed President of the Royal Naval College at Greenwich, and Vice-Admiral Sir David Beatty is appointed to Admiral Jellicoe's place as commander-in-chief of the Grand Fleet. A change at the War Office was announced on December 2, the Master-General of the Ordnance, Major-Gen. Sir Stanley B. von Donop, whose conduct of the department has been subjected to furious criticism, being succeeded by Major-Gen. William T. Furse.

In France, also, considerable discontent with the present conduct of the war has manifested itself. The secret sessions of Parliament have formed the text for editorial writers to contrast unfavorably the rapid decisions and inflexible purpose of Germany with the compromises and half measures said to be the mode in France, and the demand is made for the full mobilization of the nation's industries. Point is given to these editorial exhortations by the adoption by the German Reichstag on December 2 of the Labor Conscription bill.

The crisis in the affairs of Greece came to a head last week, and is not yet safely passed. King Constantine and the Crown Council refused to yield to the ultimatum of the Entente Powers, which expired on December 1, demanding the surrender of the army's artillery and the greater part of its munitions, and French, British, and Italian contingents were landed in Athens on the same day, an extension of time for compliance with the ultimatum being, however, accorded. Fighting appears to have been started by the Greek troops, especially by the reservists, who had received instructions from the King to resist the occupation by the Allies of buildings in Athens, and severe clashes, resulting in a large number of casualties, took place. Immediate hostilities were finally stayed by a compromise, brought about apparently by the intervention of the Dutch and Spanish Ministers, by which the King's Government agreed to surrender six of the ten batteries demanded, and the Entente troops withdrew to the Piræus. A settlement, however, is very far from having been reached. Venizelists, including the Mayor of Athens, have been removed from office; others have been arrested. Lord Robert Cecil, in the House of Commons on Monday, put the responsibility for the affair on the King, virtually charging him with breach of faith, and stated that immediate steps would be taken to obtain a radical solution of the situation. As a first step, an embargo has been placed on all Greek shipping in ports of the Entente Allies.

The American Government took further action last week in the matter of the Belgian deportations by informing the German Government on its own behalf of the painful impression made on the American people and Government by the deportations, both on the broad grounds of humanity and because of the fear that the Belgian relief work, administered by Americans, may be interfered with. That the fear is well grounded is the burden of a "declaration" by the British Government published in Tuesday's papers.

Refusal by the British Government of the Austrian request, presented through Ambassador Page, for a safe-conduct for the newly appointed Austrian Ambassador to Washington, Count Adam Tarnowski von Tarnow, has been followed by a direct request for a safe-conduct, addressed by the State Department to the British and French Governments.

The tale of ships sunk by submarines since we wrote last week is thirty-eight, neutral and belligerent. This includes the American ship Chemung, which was sent to the bottom, as it now appears, by an Austrian submarine off the coast of Spain, after warning had been given. Dispatches from Washington of December 1 announced the receipt of a communication from Germany, the text of which has not yet been published, expressing the willingness of the German Government to make reparation for the sinking of the Marina, if it can be shown that she was not an armed transport at the time of the attack.

Rumania is the only seat of war where operations of importance have taken place. While it is not thought probable that Bucharest can be saved (the Government left the capital for Jassy on November 28), it is hoped that the vigorous offensive initiated by Russia last week may be instrumental in turning the tide for the Rumanian armies, and may at least prevent the cutting off of any considerable portion of them. From Moldavia and the Carpathians to the northeast, where the Russians have gained a footing at Kirlibaba, von Brussiloff (if it be true, as reported, that he is in command) is exerting pressure on von Falkenhayn, which, however, has not prevented that general from crossing the lower Argechu River, outflanking the Rumanian forces, and planting his heavy artillery within range of the capital. South of Bucharest, on the Danube, Russian reinforcements newly arrived have met with some success, but obviously it has come too late to save the capital.

A raid by Zeppelins over the northeastern counties of England, which took place on the night of November 27-28, resulted in very little military damage, except the loss of two of the Zeppelins, which were brought down by attacking aeroplanes off the coast. The crews of both perished. A German aeroplane which dropped bombs on London on the following day was subsequently brought down near Dunkirk.

Definite announcement was made by Premier Trepoff in the Russian Duma on Sunday that an agreement was concluded by the Allies in 1915, and subsequently adhered to by Italy, that Russia, at the conclusion of the war victoriously for the Allies, should have the Dardanelles and Constantinople.

In consequence of the caution issued by the Federal Reserve Board on November 28, J. P. Morgan & Co. on Saturday of last week announced the withdrawal of the proposed issue of British and French short-term Treasury bills. The action was taken, it was explained, as a result of instructions received from the British Chancellor of the Exchequer and the French Minister of Finance.

The outlook in Mexico continues depressing. Villa occupied Chihuahua City last week, the Carranzista forces retreating in disorder to Juarez. It was not expected that Villa would continue to hold the city, and on Monday came the news of its reoccupation by forces of Ozuna and Murguia, Villa having retreated westward with trainloads of loot. The Americans in the city are reported, as we write, to be safe. The Constitutional Congress of Mexico assembled at Queretaro on December 1, being welcomed with an address by Carranza outlining the work before it, and the spirit of liberal reform which must animate its deliberations.

The lighting plant for the illumination of the Statue of Liberty was formally dedicated by the President on December 2. Considerable attention has been attracted by Mr. Wilson's speech at the banquet which followed the ceremonies, particularly by his eloquent tribute to France, and by the following words which immediately preceded that tribute: "Throughout the last two years there has come more and more into my heart the conviction that peace is going to come to the world only with liberty. With all due and sincere respect for those who represent other forms of government than ours, perhaps I may be permitted to say that peace cannot come so long as the destinies of men are determined by small groups who make selfish choices of their own." The President's words have been interpreted variously by various minds.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Week

Speaker Clark, facing the prospect of a Congress that will have to work hard to go home early next March, vents the irritation that preceding sessions have bred by offering some radical suggestions. No one but a Speaker could so summarily throw out proposals for reducing the membership to 300, clearing the galleries, and cutting down the *Congressional Record* to the merest journal that shall conform to Constitutional demands. None but a Speaker—who cannot speak—knows what it is to listen to hours of oratory addressed to distant constituents alone. None knows so well what it is to face the confusion of 435 members in general manifesting indifference to the national business. The House galleries contain 2,500 people, and on occasion may afford no little vexation to a presiding officer. Even if it were possible to overlook the difficulties before real debate, and to regard the House as a panel for the selection of committees and a body chiefly interested in voting, the inefficient conduct of balloting and roll-call is enough to disgust a parliamentary leader. Upon this last Speaker Clark determines to concentrate chief attention. He knows his other plans are impracticable, but he has hope of voting-machines.

There ought to be the strongest possible protest by the press of the country against the censorship declared by the navy in Santo Domingo. Last week there was set up in that island an American military dictatorship headed by Capt. Harry S. Knapp—as un-American a procedure as one could well imagine. Right on top of that comes the news that the whole island is to be shrouded in a veil of silence, to be lifted only as the naval officers see fit. Now, with all possible respect for the fidelity to duty of our navy men, there recurs to us that saying of Abraham Lincoln's to the effect that no man is good enough to govern others without their consent. If it is now absolutely necessary for us temporarily to govern Santo Domingo, let us do it in the open, so that the whole world, and particularly the Pan-American world, may judge of the benevolence of our acts and our intentions. We are not in a state of war with Santo Domingo, so that it is inconceivable that any criticism of what the navy is doing could harm those in occupation. But even if it did, there is not a single sound reason why the press of this country should not have the freest knowledge of what is going on in that unhappy island. Every one can recall what took place in certain portions of the Philippines behind the censorship.

We confess that to our minds things have gone from bad to worse in Santo Domingo since our intervention. First we were merely to administer the customs houses. Then we stepped in to enforce peace and were assured that all went well. Next we take over the whole island, and this not even by civilians. Is it not a profound cause for uneasiness to read that Capt. Knapp is going to respect only those laws which do not "conflict with the object of the occupation"? But who is to be the judge of this? Capt. Knapp or Mr. Daniels or Congress? Congress will hardly have the opportunity if the censorship continues, and the American public will have no basis for any opinion whatever. As for Mr. Wilson, it is safe to say that he knows nothing of what is going on. When it is brought to his attention and he realizes how completely this high-handed procedure in Santo Domingo gives the lie to all his assertions as to what we should do in Mexico, we believe he will act, and act quickly. Congress, too, ought to investigate the whole situation and find out why all these years of benevolent supervision and interference in Santo Domingo have resulted only in the complete collapse of the Government there.

Now is the time for Carranza's Government to make good its long-delayed promise of an active campaign against the Villistas. The operations of the de-facto generals should not stop with the reoccupation of Chihuahua. They are in a more favorable position to conduct a pursuit of the Villista bands than they have been since Pershing's entry into Mexico. Gen. Murguia's advance upon Chihuahua after his decisive victory thirty miles south of the city has been so swift and energetic as to indicate that Carranza has found a much more capable leader than the slothful Trevino. With Murguia coming up from the south, Gonzalez moving down from Juarez, and our own forces in northern Chihuahua to be counted upon, the round-up of the Villista raiders, if seriously undertaken, ought to bring permanent results. In Gen. Bell's reports the statement is explicitly made that no one as yet has succeeded in identifying the formidable Pancho as among those present in the fighting at Chihuahua. It is still possible that Villa is dead and that minor leaders have capitalized his reputation for a final effort which, in spite of its temporary success at Chihuahua, only shows that they are incapable of offering permanent and organized resistance to the de-facto Government. It is a campaign of banditry and loot that Carranza must deal with; a species of warfare that calls less for large armies than for resolute action.

Mr. Roosevelt's disappointment with the outcome of the election is keen but not overwhelming. And the more he thinks over the matter in the course of his brief résumé the more cheerful he gets to be. In the beginning he is inclined to think that the trouble is with the nation's moral fibre. Later it occurs to him that we are not really wicked, but only asleep. Towards the end it turns out that we are not asleep at all, but, on the contrary, very wide awake. So awake were we that the ordinary preëlection gold brick of the professional politician utterly failed to deceive. In developing this argument Mr. Roosevelt makes confession of his own errors, in very subtle form, to be sure, but still a confession:

> When public men are readily pardoned for making any promise which they think will secure public favor before election, and for repudiating any promise which they think it inconvenient to keep after election, it is impossible to expect that the voters will not finally grow skeptical about all promises, prophecies, and statements made during the course of a campaign.

Now, this at first sight would seem to be pointing straight at Mr. Wilson; but logically it cannot be. It would be absurd to argue that the people, disgusted with Mr. Wilson's violated pledges, showed their resentment by reëlecting him. The reference is really to Mr. Roosevelt himself. The people, wide awake to the emptiness of preëlection pledges and conversions, refused to vote for Roosevelt, the ally of Perkins and Penrose, and voted for the real Roosevelt as embodied in the ideas which Mr. Wilson stole. Thus while the outcome of the election is to Mr. Roosevelt a sorrow, yet it is a sweet sorrow.

A movement to reorganize the Progressive party was revealed last Friday by the publication of a circular letter. It calls for a gathering of Progressives in various States, with the possibility of a national meeting in St. Louis, in a month or two, to draw up "new articles of faith." The letter argues that the one thing clearly "shown" by the Presidential election was the burning desire of the people that the Progressive party should continue to exist. Few had noticed this, but it may be true. Anyhow, a body of brave resurrectionists are going to do their best to remove the Progressive corpse from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tomb in which Roosevelt tenderly laid it. Is the Colonel himself to be asked to join the revivified Progressives? Well, it is vaguely explained that he will be more interested for a time in the Fiji Islanders. But the astounding thing is the frank statement that Mr. George W. Perkins will not even be invited to meet with his former fellow-Progressives. They state brutally that they want neither him nor his check-book. But the reorganization of a wrecked party and Perkins not in it? Incredible!

Our Government's first official action in regard to the German enslavement of Belgian workingmen was limited to the transmittal of a protest in the name of Belgium. Now, it is stated, the Washington Administration is acting direct. It will inform the German Government that the Belgian deportations are making a very bad impression in this country. This is to put it mildly. A stronger representation would be supported by a well-nigh unanimous American press. It would be also by mass meetings to voice indignation, such as the one which, we are glad to see, is soon to be held in New York. German authorities have defiantly said that the lawless and cruel process in Belgium will go on, "no matter what the outside world may think." The only thing to be considered is the "security" of Germany. This sort of repellent egoism is, as M. Gabriel Hanotaux has been pointing out, the constant feature in all of the official talk of peace in Germany. Chancellor and press continually prate of the "guarantees" which Germany must have; what other nations are to do or suffer does not matter. But it is impossible to persist in such an attitude. Germany cannot forever affect to have no regard for the opinion of mankind. And her responsible rulers, as they see the moral judgment of the world shaping itself so sollemnly against them, will in time cry out: "Our punishment is greater than we can bear."

The dispatches from London tend to show that the Cabinet "crisis" was not so serious an affair as at first reported. It appears now to be only one more in the list of crises which Mr. Asquith has successfully got over. There will probably be a few readjustments. It is understood that the War Council within the Cabinet will be made over—authority to make swift decisions being placed in the hands of a smaller number of men than at present. The aim of the whole, and of whatever new Cabinet arrangements are made, was declared by the Prime Minister to be the most vigorous prosecution of the war. This has already drawn the fangs of the critics. The Coalition Government has not been popular. One never is in England, according to the historic tradition. But the certain thing about the Coalition Government of to-day is that it cannot be upset against its will. Its assured majority in the House of Commons is immense. And as the life of the present Parliament has been extended—and probably will be extended until the end of the war—there is no way of getting at the Ministry through a general election. If the Cabinet were disposed to show a cavalier disregard for adverse public opinion, it is so powerfully intrenched that it could do so. Moreover, a good and desired alternative to the existing Ministry is not to be found in England. The first-class men of both parties are already in it. Doubtless a few public men of talent and energy can be pointed to outside, but they are neither numerous enough nor weigh enough to be thought of as capable of making an acceptable Cabinet by themselves. Indeed, all the talk has been, not of expelling the Cabinet, but of re-making it. The old cards were to remain; they were merely to be re-shuffled. By this process, the more the Cabinet is changed the more it remains the same thing.

With all these political certainties and impossibilities clearly before the British people, how are we to account for the attacks upon the Cabinet? That they have had some force is established by the fact that Mr. Asquith has thought it prudent to yield something to them. It is plain that, quite apart from partisan motives or journalistic ambitions, there must be a good deal of dissatisfaction with the Government in England. It arises out of the war. There is a general feeling that not sufficient foresight and energy and rapidity of action have been displayed. The British do not expect their rulers to exhibit the autocratic efficiency of a militarized German Government, but they do look for fewer delays in deciding important matters, for a more concentrated intensity in the counsels of the nation, and for a fuller and wiser exertion of the naval and military power of the Empire. The dashing of the hopes centred on Rumania's entering into the war must have made a deep and unhappy impression in England. And the renewal of submarine devastation cannot fail to have fostered discontent with the Government. Professional alarmists like Admiral Beresford and J. L. Garvin and the cheap newspapers exaggerate the facts, of course; but they must be speaking for many who are disquieted. This sort of feeling Mr. Asquith may be able to appease temporarily; but everything will come back, in the end, to the outlook of the war. That this is not rosy for the Allies just at present is the main reason why we are having the flurry in the British Cabinet.

While Vice-Admiral Beatty seems extraordinarily young to have the entire responsibility of the naval defence of Great Britain placed upon his shoulders at forty-five, as a matter of fact the distinguished English admirals of history have usually assumed their highest functions at a comparatively early age. Nelson was but forty-seven in the hour of his victory at Trafalgar, while Hawke was forty-two when he defeated the French at Belle-Isle; twelve years later he won his second great victory at Quiberon. Hood became commander-in-chief on the American coast at forty-three, and Drake began his long career of freebooting at the age of thirty-two. Yet the rule has not always held, Rodney winning his great victory off Cape St. Vincent at sixty-two, while Sir John Hawkins played a valiant part in the defeat of the Spanish Armada at fifty-six. Our American admirals, too, have shown that age did not necessarily debar them from displaying the highest qualities. Thus, Farragut was sixty-one when he took New Orleans, and Porter fifty-one when he took Fort Fisher. Dewey defeated the Spaniards in his sixty-first year, and Sampson commanded the fleet off Cuba at fifty-eight. Jellicoe himself, whom Vice-Admiral Beatty has now relieved, is fifty-seven years old. On the land side of this war it has been a battling of comparatively old men, notably on the German side, many of the leading generals being well beyond the age-retirement limit of the United States army. But Sir Douglas Haig, commanding the British army in France, is in his fifty-sixth year.

Constantinople and the Dardanelles have been guaranteed to Russia by the Allies "in the most definite manner." An arrangement that has been assumed from the beginning of the war, that has been more than hinted at by Sir Edward Grey, that was announced with greater certainty by Professor Milyukoff, leader of the Liberal majority in the Duma, is now formally made public by the new Russian Premier. The stated reason for making announcement at the present moment is that Russians may know "for what cause they are shedding their blood." In other words, it is an exhortation to in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creased energy and greater sacrifices at a moment when Rumania has cast a bleak aspect over the Allied cause. But Premier Trepoff's words are addressed not only to the Russian people, but to Germany and Russia's own allies. It is explicit notification that all possibility of a separate peace with Germany is dead. By appealing to the ancient Russian sentiment that clusters about Byzantium, Premier Trepoff would give notice that the pro-German intrigues of the Stürmer Cabinet are at an end. To Berlin's announcement of a reëstablished Polish kingdom, the Russian Government retorts, not merely that it is determined to keep Poland out of Teutonic hands, but that it still holds fast to the proudest purpose of Russian policy—the acquisition of Constantinople. Far from considering herself beaten, Russia sees no reason why she should yield anything from her original programme.

Greece is another example of the good fortune that always comes to the help of the Allies whenever the Allies are engaged in a regrettable bit of war business. This good fortune inevitably takes the form of the appearance of Germany on the scene. Germany is the *deus ex machina* upon whom the Allies can count whenever they are in a moral fix. There are obvious distinctions between Allied coercion in Greece and Germany's course in Belgium. But the fact that the Allies came into Greece by invitation of Venizelos, and are now backed by that leader and a majority of the Greek nation, need not be rehearsed. When all apologies for Allied policy in Greece are made it is still true that the situation brings a bitter taste into the mouth. Left to itself, the conscience of the world might ultimately revolt against the high-handed treatment of Greece by the Allies. But neutral conscience is not left to itself. At the right moment Germany steps in and by protesting solemnly against the Allied violation of international law in Greece, wins public approval for almost anything the Allies may see fit to do. This is the fearful handicap which the German Government has imposed on itself and the worst degradation it has inflicted on the German people: that no violation of law and humanity is henceforth conceivable which the conscience of the world will not palliate by the thought of Germany in Belgium.

Fresh evidence that one of the prices Georgia is paying for the exploits of her mobs is an alarming emigration of negroes East and North, appears in the Atlanta *Constitution's* report of a concerted movement to check it for industrial reasons. The heaviest migration, runs a dispatch to the *Constitution*, has been from those counties in which there have been the worst outbreaks:

> It is developed by investigation that where there have been lynchings the negroes have been most eager to believe what the emigration agents have told them of plots for the removal or extermination of the race. Comparatively few negroes have left Dougherty County, which is considered significant, in view of the fact that this is one of the counties in southwest Georgia in which a lynching has never occurred.

Georgia's Legislature has several times moved against emigration agents, and put heavy license taxes upon them, but such work in checking their activities is destroyed when the negroes are driven into their very arms. The State is losing much of its best labor, while the negro is thrown from the home environment that ought to be best for him. It is not strange that the *Constitution* declares that "mob activity has . . . grown from bad to worse until it has become not only a social and moral, but a serious business problem. It is imperative that we get back to a basis of law and order, not half-heartedly, not half-way, but wholly and determinedly."

According to press reports, the Rev. Dr. Joseph H. McMahon, in a lecture on "Catholics in Public Life; Their Responsibilities and Failures," is going out of his way to characterize Joseph P. Tumulty, President Wilson's secretary, and Mayor Mitchel as Catholics who have betrayed their church. Of Mayor Mitchel he is reported as saying: "One who proclaimed himself a co-religionist and an exponent of the church betrayed it." This lecture is being delivered before associations of a kind to make it appear that the highest dignitaries of the church are not displeased by Dr. McMahon's activities. Now, we have free speech in this country on religious as well as other subjects. But the public surely has a right to protest against judging public men from the point of view of their relationship to a given church. If Catholics take such a position, their church must expect to encounter a good deal of severe criticism and rouse intense feeling. Dr. McMahon may criticise the public judgments and acts of Messrs. Tumulty and Mitchel as much as he pleases, but to base that criticism on the ground of disloyalty to their church is a different matter; it is bad for that church and is a very poor brand of Americanism.

No discussion of the "movies" as the art of the future can be complete without taking cognizance of the fact that prices in the neighborhood picture theatres are ten cents in the evening and only five cents at other times. The reason, of course, is the child. To busy mothers in crowded city sections Charlie Chaplin has come in the rôle of governess and traffic policeman. For the price of a nickel the nine-year-old is kept off the streets for an hour or two in the afternoon; and the afternoon audiences in poor or moderately comfortable neighborhoods are made up largely of little ones unattended. From this situation have arisen all sorts of evils with which child-welfare agencies are now contending. But it is the comparatively rare mother who stops to weigh such dangers against the usefulness of the "nickelodeon" in the way of taking the child off her hands, giving him amusement, and, most of all, keeping him out of the danger of street traffic. The small coin which formerly was devoted to candy to keep the child happy and give the mother freedom for her work, now goes to contribute to the support of an industry which ranks in importance with steel and coal.

Once the importance of the juvenile audience in the movie business is recognized, it becomes plain that the art of the movies must in large measure be shaped by that factor. The public, to which must be given what it wants, is now drawn from the primary school ages with a fair sprinkling of kindergarten upper-classmen. Obviously, the scenario writers are now busy upon an art that is democratic with a vengeance. They must cater to an appeal infinitely broader than the playwright must keep in mind when he sets out to please at the same time Broadway and Kankakee. He solves the problem by going in for the elemental emotions which are the same on both sides of the Hudson, by appealing, as the phrase goes, to the child that is in all of us. The movie writer must go further. He must appeal to the infant that is in all of us. That the trick can be done is attested by the present state of the new art. It is all very simple. The infant cannot always understand and like what his parents do. It remains, therefore, to make the parents like what their youngest likes. The thing has been done before in the case of the newspaper "comic." Starting out as a Sunday device for keeping the children quiet while father was asleep, it has become the everyday necessity for father's sporting page and mother's home page.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "OBJECTS OF THE WAR."

We accepted this war for an object, a worthy object, and the war will end when that object is attained. Under God, I hope it will never end until that time.

This is not the utterance of a German statesman, nor of a French patriot, nor of an English Minister. The words are those of the humane Abraham Lincoln. They occur in a little speech which he made at a Sanitary Fair in Philadelphia, June 16, 1864. Lincoln's "object" was, of course, the saving of the American Union. With that assured, he would have been ready at any date between April, 1861, and April, 1865, to order a suspension of hostilities. Again and again he declared that the Confederates could have peace by the simple act of admitting the supremacy of the United States Government. Nor did Lincoln, though his heart was thus fixed on the one great purpose, neglect any means that might possibly achieve it short of fighting the war through. He proposed at one time to pay for slave property, if the South would lay down its arms. He did not refuse to send peace commissioners to meet Southern delegates. Even to Horace Greeley's trip to Canada, to meet supposed peace emissaries, he assented. In short, with the most inflexible determination regarding the goal sought through the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln always cared more for the goal than for the exact method of reaching it.

The objects of the war in Europe have been more and more clearly defined, with the passage of time, since its beginning. This, too, was a war which the Allies "accepted." They did not seek it. The outside world thinks today that it was forced upon them, and we firmly believe that the verdict of history will be that this opinion is correct. And it is not surprising that in the first days of confusion and resentment there should have been uncertainty about the real and ultimate purpose of the nations that resisted the German attack. But their ideas have been clarified as the months of horror and of sacrifice have sped past, until now there is virtual agreement concerning the ends aimed at in the gigantic fighting. The earlier loose talk about smiting Germany to the dust and breaking up the German Empire has given way to more sober statements. The best and most authoritative of these have come from the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary of England. What they have said is that the Allies would sheathe the sword the moment they could be assured of the restoration of Belgium and Servia, with the right of small nationalities to develop in peace, and of some form of certain guarantee that another such war should not burst upon the world.

Here, surely, are "worthy" objects of the war. If it is necessary to fight on to secure them, we share the conviction that the Allies are bound to pour out more blood and treasure. In particular do we feel as keenly as we did when Germany was trampling Belgium under foot, that England would be forever disgraced if she did not fling into the combat all that she has, if to do so is necessary in order to put back the Belgian people into their homes. It is not a question of being pro-Ally or anti-German, but of a monstrous crime crying to heaven to be righted. And if the only way to right it is by continuing the bloody struggle, then we shall have to speak of the war, in the exalted and devout phrases which Lincoln used in his second Inaugural, as the "scourge" mysteriously employed by the Almighty to work out His ripening purposes for the children of men.

This, however, is not now the case presented by those in neutral countries, and by many in the belligerent nations, who are urging steps towards peace. They do not wish to surrender a single one of the worthy objects of the war. They merely raise the question whether it may not be possible to attain those objects without fighting on till utter exhaustion comes. If they could be so attained, not alone every man of humane instincts, but every soldier in the field—unless he had fallen into the state dreaded by Gen. Robert E. Lee, where military men love war for its own sake—would turn away from further bloodshed with a shudder. Now, it can do no harm to debate this. We shall not see a Peace Congress among the warring nations to-morrow or next week or next month. But it can do only good to set men discussing what will have to be done when such a Congress does meet; or to begin to formulate the terms that must be demanded if we are to "achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace." And no more than this is really intended by the proposals of one tenor and another which philanthropic and sagacious men are putting forward. They do not expect to succeed at the first attempt. They count upon delays and rebuffs. But they insist that it is well to begin talking freely all round about the true objects of the war. The sooner we know accurately the terms of a possible peace demanded by the various belligerents, the sooner will peace among them become possible.

FREE DISCUSSION OF WAR AND PEACE.

A lively and instructive debate took place in the House of Commons on November 16. Questions were asked regarding a peace meeting in Cardiff which had been broken up in a riotous manner. The replies of the Government were so unsatisfactory that the Labor leader, J. H. Thomas—who has, by the way, stood firmly for the resolute prosecution of the war, and greatly aided the Government in its dealings with munition-workers, and so on—moved the adjournment of the House, in order that the matter might be thoroughly discussed. Mr. Thomas declared that a war for liberty must not be so waged as to deprive British citizens of the liberty freely to meet and to say what they thought of military compulsion or the terms of a possible peace.

The Home Secretary, Mr. Samuel, made in reply an adroit and fair-sounding speech. He stood by, in principle, the historic English position that "an Executive Government in a democratic country such as this ought not, especially in a time of war, to assume to itself a right of determining when opposition to its own policy should be expressed, and when it should not be expressed." He also adhered to the view that it was wisest to let dissatisfied people blow off their steam in public, rather than drive them into secret movements which might be more formidable than open ones. The right of public meeting, to be sure, was qualified in wartime. Responsibility was thrown upon the Home Secretary by the Defence of the Realm act. Mr. Samuel stated that he had received many requests to suppress meetings, on the ground of apprehended disorder, but had "always declined" to do so. He gave the general assurance that "the Home Office and the police would do their best to secure freedom of speech, which even in time of war the Government of this country had always tried to maintain." But he proceeded to point out that, outside of London, the police authorities were locally independent; they had the power to decide whether a peace meeting would lead to disturbance, and to prohibit it for the sake of public order. Of course, they have done this many times. Mr. Samuel did not deny this, but he did affirm, with a pleasing flash of the old Liberal spirit, that he thought it better that such a meeting as that at Cardiff should be allowed to be held, even if accompanied by disorder, so that it might not be said throughout the world that the British Government had been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"imitating its enemies and preventing the expression of opinion."

Opinion has certainly been more freely expressed in Parliament of late. There are, it is true, papers like the *Saturday Review* which contend that no member of the House of Commons should be allowed to ask a question, much less make a speech, about the terms of peace; but the practice is growing. Mr. Snowden, for example, called upon the Government a few days ago to state its view of the tentative peace proposals of the German Chancellor, and to let the country know whether it would not take steps to "promote peace negotiations." In answer, Mr. Bonar Law declared that the speech of the German Chancellor was "based entirely on the idea of a peace after a German victory"; and that the Government stood by the statement of peace conditions made by the Prime Minister. It is clear that this leaves the diplomatic deadlock where it was; but every sign is to be welcomed that people in England are recovering their freedom of speech about the war and about the possibilities of peace.

In Germany something of the same kind is visible. Strangely, the assertion of the right of the people, as represented in the Reichstag, to be consulted about the settlement of the war, was made in connection with the setting up by the German Government of the dubious Kingdom of Poland. This was regarded as a definite abandonment of the hope of a separate peace with Russia; and a great many Germans had clung to that. But the point is made by several German newspapers that this act is a violation of the promise that the people should have a voice in the terms of peace. Here is a step away from a certain kind of possible peace, yet the Ministry took it without in the least asking the approval of the Reichstag. On this head even an organ like the Berlin *Post* affirms:

> A painful impression makes itself felt. The Polish solution is the product of an autocratic form of government such as could not have been revealed in a more drastic form in this war, which has already taught us a few lessons. And this in spite of the fact that the German people and its leaders had from the beginning demanded nothing more urgently than that they should be heard before the negotiations had been completed.

It cannot, unhappily, be said that the end of the war is in sight. The mighty passions which it has let loose seem almost as if they had got beyond the control of Governments. It is not surprising that Kings and Emperors are aghast at the terrible forces which they had not the statesmanship to hold in leash. But this is no reason why there should not be the freest discussion of a way out, not only for the belligerents, but for all civilization. Refusal even to debate it or to attempt to define it will not much longer be tolerable. There ought to be a much clearer "standing offer" of peace than we have yet had from either the Allies or the Teutonic Powers. A writer in the December *Atlantic* does not put it too strongly when he says: "Each belligerent is under the gravest suspicion till terms are unequivocally stated."

GERMAN EFFICIENCY AND GERMAN MILITARISM.

For the most thoroughgoing admirers of Prussian militarism, not as a military system merely but as a social force, we must look outside of Germany. They are found abundantly in this country. It is doubtful whether a Treitschke or a Bernhardi has ever claimed for the Prussian drill-sergeant the miracle-working powers which any Defence Society in these United States is ready, nay, eager, to concede him. Through all exhortations to a greater national efficiency for America there runs the assumption that German efficiency to-day is what the German army has made it. Intelligence, education, industry, thrift, loyalty, obedience, family discipline, the sense of order and of cooperation, have all been injected into the German blood by the gigantic hypodermic of the General Staff. That is why compulsory military service is so ardently advocated by people who would never have conscription for its own sake: Heaven forbid. It is in order to teach our boys a decent respect for their parents that we need universal training; in order to teach our manufacturers how to utilize waste products; to teach our workers how to labor fruitfully and keep themselves well; to teach our city governments how to eliminate graft; to teach our farmers how to double their crops. In other words, it is in order to educate a new set of virtues into the American people that we must have compulsory service. For see what Prussian militarism has done for the German people!

In this sense Gen. Leonard Wood far outstrips von Hindenburg and von Reventlow in his appraisal of German militarism. When von Hindenburg announces a victory he gives credit, in the first place, to the German people, to their heroism, their loyalty, their resourcefulness, and their capacity for self-sacrifice. Every German defiance, every German assertion of the nation's readiness and ability to hold out to the end, is based only in part on the Empire's military efficiency. Much the heavier stress is laid on those "purely German" virtues which were German for centuries before history knew Frederick the Great, von Roon, and Moltke. The gospel of Germany's destiny to rule the nations, at which the world has had its laugh, is not based by its proponents on the virtues of the German soldier, but on the biological superiority of the German race. It is not Frederick and Moltke that made the German an Aryan, that made him blond, that made him the agent for the highest aspirations of the human soul, that made him, in short, that perfect creation which Houston Stewart Chamberlain and his school have so completely described; nature did it. Even the German's fighting ability, which might well be credited to the teachings of Prussian militarism, is regarded by these panegyrists as only the manifestation of that *Furor Teutonicus* which the Roman historian identified a good many years before Frederick. When a German speaks of the Prussian army as the maker of Germany, he is speaking only of the German state. He regards the army as the instrument which has given unity and security to the German people, and so enabled it to develop its natural capacities. But when an American orator on preparedness speaks of the Prussian army he credits it with everything, from Sedan to dyestuffs, from aspirin to Roentgen and Dr. Ehrlich.

As between Gen. Leonard Wood and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the latter is much nearer to the truth; not surely in the sense of the pre-ordained biological superiority of the German race, but in the implication that the present strength and efficiency of the German people are to be explained primarily by certain natural virtues which militarism may have disciplined, economized, capitalized, but which it certainly did not create. Why is it that the German army has regularly failed against its opponents in the west and has regularly succeeded against its enemies in eastern Europe? Because armies to-day cannot be divorced from nations. It is the entire resources of the nations that are now pitted against one another, and Germany's demonstrated superiority over the Slav in battle is only a reflection of the superiority of German national efficiency to Slav efficiency. That superiority, to any one acquainted with even the outlines of European history, is not the creation of yesterday or the day before. For nearly a thousand years the civic virtues of the German people have given them the leadership in central and eastern Europe. Long before Frederick the Great, the German settlements

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Poland, in Russia, in Transylvania, were the centres of a higher—the dangerous word must be used—*Kultur*. The skilled artisans and merchants in mediæval Slavdom were the Germans. They composed the Bürgertum, the bourgeoisie, with the rise of which modern progress is so intimately bound up. The German colonists in Russia up to the present have been models of systematic and intelligent labor among an unprogressive and primitive population. The Russian of to-day uses the term German as a testimonial and a sneer. In Tolstoy, in Turgenieff, in Dostoievsky, German stands for a materialistic but concededly efficient mode of life.

Neither the German army nor the state will primarily explain Germany's modern industrial development and her emergence as a formidable competitor among the nations of the West. Dyestuffs did not proceed directly from Sedan, but from that gift for intense concentration, for infinite research, for patient experiment, which gave a name to German scholarship long before the German Empire came into being. It is beside the question to renew the debate whether German scholarship ever produced works of genius, or whether the German chemists have made original discoveries. A synthetic dye industry may be developed without genius, just as a battle may be won through sheer preliminary drudgery.

This question, then, it would be well for our preparedness experts in national psychology to keep in mind: Whether German military efficiency has created the German national efficiency, or whether it is itself the product of historic national traits. And, secondly, whether an American psychology can be created by the imposition of the German system of military gymnastics, or whether America can best realize itself by being true to its own genius.

THE RESERVE BOARD AND LOANS TO EUROPE.

The statement issued at Washington by the Federal Reserve Board last week regarding investment of American bank funds in Treasury bills of European Governments deserves weighty consideration, as the opinion of the responsible central committee of our banking system. It is necessary to read the statement with great care, however, in order to avoid misunderstanding of its purport. We have already observed some disposition to infer that the Board is objecting to the loans offered by European Governments in this market, on the basis of their soundness as investments. But the Board does nothing of the kind.

Quite to the contrary, its statement specifically points out that "the natural absorbing power of the investment market supplies an important regulator of the volume of our sales to foreign countries in excess of the goods that they send us." The present enormous excess of that sort has resulted mainly from purchases by European Governments, whether of foodstuffs or war munitions. The economic regulator referred to by the Board would naturally, therefore, be negotiable securities of those Governments.

It is true that the statement, after admitting that the Board "is not called upon to advise private investors," does suggest guardedly that "the investor should receive full and authoritative data—particularly in the case of unsecured loans—in order that he may judge the future intelligently." This warning, if it has any specific purpose, we should suppose to refer to such tenders as have been made in behalf of Russia and Germany, where the terms of the loan involved what was virtually a speculation in exchange rates. It could scarcely apply to the Anglo-French loan of 1915, for instance, which, being payable interest and principal in gold in the United States, provided on its face the necessary data in the simplest form. But the Board ought, in our judgment, either to have been more explicit in this matter, or else to have said nothing about it.

The language of the Federal Reserve Board clearly indicates that it has its eye simply on the bank position. The Board sees possible influences "which, if not kept under control, would tend towards instability." Its view is that this tendency might assert itself through the purchase, by a given bank or set of banks, of the short-term European Treasury bills "to a disproportionate degree," thus restricting the bank's resources available for ordinary business loans. But the Board goes further than a general reminder against overdoing a given form of discount. Taking it for granted that the proposed Treasury bills, issued to run only one to six months, will as a matter of fact be constantly renewed at maturity, the Reserve Board cautions the banks under its jurisdiction that "it does not regard it in the interest of the country at this time that they invest in foreign Treasury bills of this character."

All this, it is clear, involved a question of wise or unwise banking methods, and reflects in no sense on the soundness of the Treasury bills themselves. Judgment as to the attitude of the Board in the matter is likely to depend on the extent to which one accepts the Board's assumption of a constantly and rapidly increasing borrowing in this form. It is not a simple question. A London correspondent has cabled that offers of such bills were expected to be "merely occasional, isolated transactions." Furthermore—a point on which the Board's statement seems to us to lay insufficient stress—the proceeds, even of such sales of Treasury bills, are paid out wholly to American manufacturers or merchants, and reappear as deposits in the American banks. The Board itself admits that any "slowing down in the process of credit extension" might mean curtailment of our export trade.

On the other hand, it should be observed that the amount of English Treasury bills of the character described, at present in the hands of London banks and bankers, is abnormally large. In peace times, the bills are issued in anticipation of collection of the taxes, and are redeemed as the tax money comes in. The British Exchequer issues them nowadays in anticipation not so much of tax collections as of the floating of a long-term war loan.

Assuming, as the financial markets in the next few days appeared to do, that the Board's apprehension of an issue so large as unduly to tie up bank resources was reasonable, even Wall Street concluded, after thinking the matter over, that the warning against the Treasury bills was in line with proper conservatism. The New York agents of the European Governments in question stated on Friday that they "had been instructed by the British and French Governments to withdraw their Treasury bills for sale"; this both because of a "desire to show every regard to the Federal Reserve Board," and because the sale of such bills "has never been an essential part of the Allied Governments' financial plans." With this announcement, the incident was definitely closed.

It is clear that the dispute concerned primarily a question of banking practice and the American banking position. The Board did not suggest that the policy of our investment market making loans on a sound basis to the strong Allied Powers should be suddenly abandoned. "The United States," so says the Reserve Board's statement, "has now attained a position of wealth and of international financial power which, in the natural course of events, it could not have reached for a generation." Such an international position brings obvious international du-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties, one of which is to finance, on the basis of acquisition of securities of our foreign customers, the foreign trade which has poured this unexpected wealth into the American community.

AMERICAN INCOMES

The most striking fact presented by the figures of the income tax for the fiscal year 1916 is that the amount collected on individual incomes shows the enormous increase of 65 per cent. over the preceding year. For the year ending June 30, 1915, that amount was $41,000,000; for the year ending June 30, 1916, it was $68,000,000. The number of persons paying the tax has remained almost stationary throughout the three years during which the law has been in operation; this year the number was 337,000. It is notable, too, that while the returns show a very large increase of income all along the line among those who pay the tax, the percentage of increase is far greater among the big incomes than among those of moderate amount. This is indicated at once by the fact that the amount collected at the normal rate—one per cent. on the entire net assessable income of every individual, whatever additional amount he may have to pay as super-tax—has increased not 65, but 50 per cent. And, on examining the figures, we find that incomes below $20,000 have yielded much less than 50 per cent. increase, while the super-tax on higher incomes shows an advance of much more than 50 per cent. Indeed, of the entire $68,000,000, no less than $44,000,000 is super-tax, collected on the excess over $20,000 of an individual income, while last year this same super-tax (for the rates have not been changed) yielded only $24,000,000. We have here an increase of 80 per cent. And the rise in the rate of increase is fairly steady within the group of the super-taxed, as we advance from the well-to-do to the rich and the ultra-rich. The super-tax collected for the range from $20,000 to $50,000 increased 50 per cent., from $50,000 to $70,000 the increase was 60 per cent., from $75,000 to $100,000 it was 75 per cent., from $100,000 to $250,000 it was 85 per cent., and above that it was nearly 100 per cent. In other words, the big incomes of the country were, so far as the tax figures can be supposed to indicate them, twice as great in the calendar year 1915 as in the calendar year 1914.

There is, however, a consideration that makes this conclusion very untrustworthy, at least as meaning what it would generally be taken to mean. The law requires the listing, as part of a person's income for the year, of any gain made through the sale of securities or other property. In case the property had been bought prior to the operation of the Income-Tax law, the gain must be apportioned, the portion of it listed for taxation being determined by the ratio of the time since the law went into effect to the whole interval between purchase and sale. If the purchase was made during the income-tax period—that is, at any time since March 1, 1913—the whole gain must be listed. It is obvious that if this law was generally complied with, vast sums must have been set down for taxation as income which are not in any true sense of the word income at all. And this applies especially to the case of men of wealth. The figures give, therefore, certainly an exaggerated, and possibly a very highly exaggerated, notion of the actual increase of income during the past year. It would be possible for the Government, without in any way disclosing the affairs of individuals, to ascertain and publish the most salient facts as to the extent to which gains in the sale of securities have contributed to the increase in the legal returns of income in the aggregate and in the various classes. And if the returns are to have any value from the standpoint of economic study, this must be done.

This same consideration affects still more deeply a showing which, on its face, is even more striking than that relating to the size of the big incomes. It will be remembered that the first statement concerning the operation of the law, issued two years ago, gave the number of persons having an income of more than $1,000,000 as 44; this year the number is 120. This difference is truly startling; but it remains to be ascertained how much of it is to be ascribed to the factor just considered. That some of the increase in all directions may be owing to more rigorous administration of the law is also to be noted; but it is hardly likely that this has played a sufficient part to make a serious difference in the character of the showing. And it is only fair to remember that, after getting the bona-fide increase in true incomes, the increase is measured in money, not in substantial value. In a time of rapidly rising prices, a considerable increase of money income is properly to be set down as merely compensating for the lowered value of the money unit. That there has been a very large increase in the true incomes of the well-to-do and the rich, and that this would be shown by the tax report after all the factors we have referred to had been allowed for, is, however, quite certain.

Constitutional Rights After the War

THE PERIL OF RECENT CHANGES IN ENGLAND.

By HERBERT W. HORWILL.

LONDON, November 12.

The public mind has been so fully absorbed in the problem of military efficiency that but little notice has been taken of the grave constitutional changes that are accompanying the progress of the war. These matters seem to be of scarcely more than professional interest, though it is not lawyers alone that will be affected by them in the period of reconstruction that is to follow. Even the lawyers, for the most part, *silent inter arma,* but there has lately been a distinguished exception. A remarkable speech was delivered at Huddersfield the other day by Lord Parmoor, a member of the highest Court of Appeal in the British Empire. His high professional standing may be estimated from the fact that in 1914 he was chosen by a Liberal Prime Minister, though himself a Unionist M. P., to be raised to the peerage in order to strengthen the small body of Law Lords who represent the House of Lords in its judicial capacity. Unfortunately, the speech was very briefly reported in the press, but a reprint of it in pamphlet form now makes it possible to appreciate its full significance.

Lord Parmoor begins by a reference to the tributes that have been paid to the British Constitution by great writers, and especially to Hallam's eulogy of its "expansive energy." Does it still possess this power? "A constitution," remarks Lord Parmoor, "can hardly be regarded as satisfactory if it becomes necessary to set it on one side at a time of national stress. I do not believe that this is necessary, and hold the opinion that a constitution under which the morality and character of a people have been moulded should be the safeguard of national effort at a time of national stress. It is the fabric on which the continuity of the state depends." He points out that, even before the war, there were signs of reaction against representative government in favor of a more bureaucratic system. During the war this tendency has made such headway that to-day Burke's "sanctuary of liberty" seems "likely to become a windswept ruin." It is "hardly a paradox" to say that "for the moment the Constitution is in abeyance." With reference to the plea that a Constitution founded on representation is not suitable to a time of war crisis, Lord Parmoor reminds us that "the qualities on which we rely for success have not been forged on the military anvil, but developed under the self-discipline of freedom." Constitutional development in England has consisted "in the struggle to give to each citizen an opportunity for free thought and free action against the claim of interference made by the executive governments from time to time in power." In earlier years the struggle has been to establish a rule of law and right against individual caprice; in later years against bureaucratic encroachment. In this connection Lord Parmoor justifies the traditional British distrust of coalition governments, as under such a régime the critical

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power of the Commons is to a large extent neutralized and the dangers arising from an uncontrolled bureaucratic system tend to reappear.

At this stage of his address Lord Parmoor finds it necessary to correct some current misconceptions of what is meant by "liberty." He protests in the strongest language against "the assumption that liberty consists in giving a monopoly of power to the majority and in accepting the view that minorities must suffer." The claims of society, no doubt, impose certain limitations, but the area of restriction is being unduly extended, and "the system of official regulation or proclamation is making a sinister inroad into our constitutional system."

For the rest of his speech Lord Parmoor takes as his text a passage from J. R. Green. The historian states that, before the long rule of the Whigs after the revolution period was over, "Englishmen had forgotten that it was possible to persecute for difference of opinion, or to put down the liberty of the press, or to tamper with the administration of justice, or to rule without Parliament." Lord Parmoor proceeds to discuss whether Green's summary is applicable at the present time. He deals first with the question of ruling without Parliament, which "lies at the root of our constitutional system." As regards the House of Lords, that body is "in a condition of suspended animation." The Parliament act is on the face of it incomplete, no attempt having been made, before the great war crisis arose, to remedy the partial mutilation of the Constitution which that measure had brought about. The case of the House of Commons is much more serious. Lord Parmoor confesses it difficult to understand the ease with which that House, so often referred to as the pioneer and pattern of representative institutions, has been deprived of its representative character. By extending its own life beyond its allotted maximum term of five years, it "ceased to have a representative character and became merely a statutory body." The danger of such an innovation, Lord Parmoor thinks, can hardly be overrated. The suspension of the Constitution is the more dangerous inasmuch as, whatever contingency may arise, no register has been prepared on which an effective election can be held, so that even the machinery on which representative government depends is in abeyance. "Our history," Lord Parmoor continues, "gives no more striking instance of bureaucratic domination, and the substitution of a statutory for a representative House of Commons is in truth inconsistent with the basic principle of our Constitution. . . . It is the tendency of every body of men to increase and exaggerate the powers vested in them, and the security against this tendency in the House of Commons is the knowledge of its temporary character and the prospect of an approaching dissolution which may result in relegating many members to the position of ordinary private citizens." The argument that the risk of superseding the Constitution is less, owing to the character and love of liberty which are the heritage of the English people, has force, Lord Parmoor admits, but "it is founded on the dangerous casuistry that a citadel is not weakened by the surrender of its outlying fortifications."

What is involved in this change is then illustrated by special reference to the question of taxation. The doctrine of no taxation without representation was "the bedrock on which the popular party in the revolutionary era withstood the encroachments of the Stuart Kings." If this principle is of importance in normal times, it becomes of much greater importance when the Government is raising and spending the unprecedented sums demanded by the present war, for the policy to be determined is not merely of immediate taxation, but of heavily mortgaging the future resources of the country. "The imposition of hundreds of millions of taxation under present conditions vitiates the principle for which Hampden fought, and which has been regarded as an essential part of the Constitution." Lord Parmoor deals next with the legislative functions of Parliament. These have been delegated by it to the Executive Government in the form of a wide power to make general regulations. The Executive in England was probably strongest under the tyranny of Henry VIII, but "there is little difference between the powers given under the Proclamation act of Henry VIII and the powers of regulation or proclamation conferred on the Executive Government or on Government departments under the various Defence of the Realm acts passed since the outbreak of war." "This delegation of legislative power to the Government departments," Lord Parmoor continues, "is a deliberate overstepping of the line which divides a representative from a bureaucratic system. Locke would have said that no such delegation was permissible under any circumstances."

The remaining topics suggested by the quotation from Green are discussed by Lord Parmoor more briefly, but at sufficient length to make clear the grounds of his concern, as a constitutional lawyer, at the nature of the recent innovations. He emphasizes as "of primary importance" the risk to which the constitutional rights of the citizen are exposed by the holding of secret judicial hearings and by the imprisonment of British subjects without trial and without even being told what the charge brought against them is. The whole speech, which runs to about 6,500 words, is obviously a pronouncement of great weight, and it will probably be recognized not only by lawyers but by future historians as a document of first-rate importance to the understanding of what has been happening in England under war-time conditions.

GOVERNMENT AFTER WAR—SIGNS OF THE PRESENT TIME.

By STODDARD DEWEY.

PARIS, November 11.

I wish to note a few signs of the world to come after the war. For now, in the anguish and bloodshed of war, a new world is making. Every week gives some such sign of what is to issue from this turmoil in permanent trends of action among the peoples. In the month elapsing before this can be published, those who observe thoughtfully will find other instances in the news cabled day by day.

One surprise of this war for the average American is the continued cropping up of the question whether government shall be constitutional. He knows that our Supreme Court's business is to judge if a law of Congress or act of Government be unconstitutional; but it never occurs to him in everyday experience that national government itself—the sovereign authority of the state—may be something else than constitutional. The last few weeks have brought up this question sharply in several countries.

A first example is Switzerland. There has been a sharp clash regarding military matters and economic relations with belligerents of both sides, between the German cantons on one hand and the French and Italian cantons on the other. All the Swiss agree that the "full powers" which they conferred on their Federal Government for national defence from the beginning of the war are *inconstitutionnels*. An American wonders if they mean anything more than "ultra-constitutional" or "extra-constitutional," that is, powers to deal with cases higher or wider than their Constitution has foreseen. From the start, this war has presented so many unforeseen things that neutrals, perhaps more than belligerents, have an obscured vision of rights and powers and duties.

The recent vote of the representatives of the Swiss cantons conveys the idea that the Federal Government was authorized to throw the Constitution, insufficient or not, to the winds in stress of war. There has certainly been no nailing of the Constitution to the mast. To multiply our metaphors, it may be noted that the German Swiss who form the majority believe evidently that their Constitution has not the efficiency of the cross-bow of William Tell. And so German thought—even outside of Germany—has come to be reproached with hereditary inability to understand what is and what is not constitutional government.

A French citizen would rightfully be indignant at any suspicion that war could have moved his Republic from its firm base of constitutional government. Its written Constitution is one of the scantiest on record, yet it should be general enough to cover the widest and most sudden measures of national defence. Now, it has been evident all through that the strength of France in this unexpected war has depended on the *union sacrée* of all political parties in Parliament and their being represented together in Government—something which by no means flows from the Constitution of the French Republic. In all Parliamentary government, which our American republic was born too early to know or accept, the party which has the majority in Parliament is omnipotent. In these last days when war has become a routine, the party which has so long ruled in the French Republic—Radicals and Radical-Socialists—held its first meeting since war began and ratified this enduring situation which deprives it of constitutional rule. Yet it only depends on these politicians to use the machinery of Parliamentary government and upset the union and resume their domination.

Thus France, too, has added to her system of government, under stress of war, something which is at once essential to her life and extra-constitutional. Bagehot noted a parallel instance that might happen to ourselves: "In both the American and Swiss Constitution, the Upper House has as much authority as the second; it could produce the maximum of impediment, the deadlock, if it liked; if it does not do so it is owing, not to the goodness of the legal Constitution, but to the discreetness of the chamber." Radical discreetness in France is high patriotism and it is constitutional also, since the Radicals willingly forego their constitutional right for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their country's sake. And, without judging the constitutionality of the Swiss Government's "full powers," they are certainly legal. As to the Greek Constitution and the King of Greece, they hold all the Allies in profound contemplation.

In Russia, constitutional changes can mean little more than changes from the constituted order of the years before the war, yet they are further-reaching than anywhere else. The time is past when guileless mujiks were said to confound "Constitutzie" of the constitutional agitation with some fond diminutive of a mythic Grand Duchess Constantine. The foreign expert of the Paris *Figaro* has just been enumerating all the changes in the organization of Russian communities which have been made silently and almost spontaneously since we began hearing of Dumas and Zemstvos and the rest. They are not the breaking up of an immense jelly-fish commonwealth, but a limitation by healthy process of growth of central and bureaucratic government, and a corresponding healthy revolution in the exercise of authority through whole regions. If such changes should continue in peace as they have been doing in the long process of war, many a problem which has disheartened the friends of Russian freedom will disappear of itself. *Solvitur ambulando*—and the end of Poland is not yet.

Such changes are as difficult to fit in with their ideas of constitutional government for French republicans as they are for Americans. Both are in the habit of considering Russia as the type of absolute monarchy most opposed to constitutional government. In reality, absolute government is opposed to limited government only; and a republic may be governed constitutionally by an absolute Parliament or President, or both together. Some have thought despairingly of the republic, listening to the natural maxim of politicians favoring legality at the expense of constitutionality, just as this war had its beginning in regarding treaties as "scraps of paper" at the expense of international law. "You wouldn't let a little thing like the Constitution stand between friends!"

It all comes back to limiting government itself. Lord Acton well notes that, in America too, this has been a matter of silent growth:

"Some of the restrictions on the governing power were not fully established at first. The most important of these is the action of the Supreme Court in annulling unconstitutional laws. The Duke of Wellington said to Bunsen that by this institution alone the United States made up for all the defects of their Government. . . . The Constitution itself gives no such power. . . . It was not constitutionally recognized until 1801. . . . In the same manner religious liberty, which has become so much identified with the United States, is a thing which grew by degrees, and was not to be found imposed by the letter of the law."

In spite of the lasting evils of war, it is all clear gain that the nations should thus rapidly, under war's push and strain, mount up such degrees. It brings up the question whether constitutional government must not sooner or later imply several other sorts of government for its continued existence in a world like ours. This is the case with many labels which are plastered on communities of men. John Stuart Mill, with his usual clear-sightedness in moral sciences, that is, concerning the ebb and flow and composition of rippling, eddying motion in aggregates of human wills, brought back the question to one of representative government, which Americans believe they have. Massimo d'Azeglio, before Cavour, tried to introduce the idea into Italy travailing to new birth; and his own brother, the Jesuit Padre Taparelli d'Azeglio, with equal clear sight combated it in the name of past human nature.

Perhaps the essential condition of "free" government which was Washington's label, and of government of the people "by the people, for the people," which was Abraham Lincoln's formula, may yet be found in something which was an object of President Eliot's foresight at the very beginning of this war—federal government. Whether it is consistent with this week's autonomy of Poland under Germany's hegemony and a common army under the united "Central Powers" may be doubted. But the changes in Russia, the union of Britain with her colonies, and the initiative of French communes and departments in the people's defence, where the Constitution does not reach, and the extra-constitutional and sacred union of all political parties in the Republic—these admit of no doubt. *Solvitur ambulando.*

A League of Nations

THE DANGER OF THE PROPOSED LEAGUE CONTRASTED WITH THE ADVANTAGES OF USING AND EXTENDING THE PRESENT MACHINERY OF ARBITRATION AT THE HAGUE.

By ELLERY C. STOWELL.

At the present moment the whole world is interested in the establishment of a League of Nations. Although there is nothing novel in this perennial topic of discussion, illustrious support for the project has now been obtained: both candidates for the Presidency announced their sympathy with the plan, which is also approved by President Lowell, of Harvard, well known as an authority upon questions of government; ex-President Taft, Viscount Bryce, Viscount Grey, and a host of others. A further interest attaches to the present propaganda, since it is generally acknowledged that the approaching conclusion of the great war in Europe will be an opportune moment for improving the constitution of our international relations. The magnitude of the present conflict and the advance in civilization will make it possible to effect reforms much more radical and far-reaching than at any previous period. In the midst of the tragic events of the war many philosophers and philanthropists are looking forward to the realization of this League of Nations, as in the nature of an atonement for the degradation of carnage into which we have been plunged. It is interesting to compare their hopes and prophecies with an important proposal made by a philosopher of Massachusetts in the year 1840.*

**An Essay on the Congress of Nations.* By William Ladd. Reprinted from the original edition for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1916.

William Ladd's own words were: "It is proposed to organize a Court of Nations, composed of as many members as the Congress of Nations shall previously agree upon, say, two from each of the Powers represented at the Congress" (p. 34). The members of this court were to enjoy the same privileges and immunities as Ambassadors and to give their verdicts by a majority. In regard to their jurisdiction, Mr. Ladd proposed: "All cases submitted to the court should be judged by the true interpretation of existing treaties, and by the laws enacted by the Congress and ratified by the nations represented; and where these treaties and laws fail of establishing the point at issue, they should judge the cause by the principles of equity and justice" (p. 35).

The author, in an illuminating discussion of the objections which might be raised against such a court, enumerates them substantially as follows: that it was an innovation; that it gave too much power to a few men; that there was no machinery for the enforcing of the decrees of the court; that it would be dangerous to the maintenance of existing forms of government; that republics, being in a minority among the nations, would not have so good a chance of obtaining justice; that there existed already a satisfactory system based upon many precedents of submitting international disputes to arbitration. Ladd gives a convincing refutation to many of the arguments against this latter system, and obtained a practical vindication when the calling of the first Hague Conference brought to pass the great Congress of Nations which he foretold. This Legislature of the World, as he described it, became, as he also proposed, the Constituent Assembly of an Arbitral Tribunal. The Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague differed, however, in one important particular. Instead of Ladd's plan of two representatives appointed by each nation, holding office during good behavior, and rendering their decisions by a majority vote, the Permanent Court, as at present organized, consists of a list of arbitrators—not more than four representatives from each country—who are appointed for terms of six years, which may be renewed. They serve without compensation except as they may be specially designated to act as arbitrators in some case which is submitted to the court.

The Hague Court is evidently a compromise between the plan proposed by Ladd and the older system of unlimited choice for the selection of the arbitrators. Nevertheless, it seems to be a happy mean, such as Ladd himself commends as a cautious step along the road of progress. In the future, as public opinion becomes more and more convinced of the advantage and the necessity of having recourse to arbitration for the settlement of international differences, there will develop a greater and greater sense of obligation to select the arbitrators from the panel of The Hague. The nations now vie with one another in appointing the most distinguished of their jurists to membership

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the Court, and although there are still a few political appointees, we may expect them to disappear with the education of public opinion. As the business of the Court grows, those judges who are known to be the most impartial, wise, and expeditious will be chosen again and again as arbitrators, until it will become a physical impossibility for them to undertake any other work. This will mean that they will have become world judges in the truest and most complete sense of the word. The permanency of their tenure will be secure, since the nations can hardly fail to recognize the necessity of reappointment during good behavior. Four judges from each nation will furnish a list large enough to provide for several concurrent arbitrations. All, then, that is needed for the development of the existing Court is the increasing recourse to arbitration among the nations, and this can come about only through the education of public opinion.

There is no sufficient reason why we should hasten too rapidly to organize a court of more limited numbers sitting permanently at The Hague. At the present moment such an institution would present certain political dangers, and only those nations would be likely to have recourse to it who believed that its decisions would generally prove advantageous. Others would hesitate to add to the prestige of an institution which might limit their freedom of action. The remarkable institution which we now possess preserves the perfect impartiality of its action by the elasticity of its composition. Again, a court sitting permanently, if it is to provide for the great development of arbitration which is likely to ensue in the near future, must be of sufficient numbers to make it possible to detail from its members one or more judges to hear certain of the less important cases which are referred to it; otherwise the procedure and the reaching of a decision will be prolonged, to the general disrepute of the method. The inability of a small, rigid court to expedite its business will endanger its usefulness at the very moment when the advantage of recourse to arbitration is becoming most widely appreciated. The present loose organization, on the contrary, permits the Powers to choose from the panel of the Hague Tribunal the best group of jurists free to accept the office of arbitrator. If four from each nation should not prove a sufficient quota for the business of the world, it would be an easy matter at any time to increase the number.

It is hard to believe that the gifted author of a plan for the Congress of Nations would not have recognized these advantages of the present panel of The Hague and have preferred this flexible form of court to a more rigid organization which might not stand the strain of necessary world adjustment. However that may be, it is impossible to misinterpret him in regard to the machinery for the enforcing of the court's decrees. He says:

> The power of the court to be merely advisory. It is to act as a high court of admiralty, but without its enforcing powers. There is to be no sheriff, no posse, to enforce its commands. It is to take cognizance only of such cases as shall be referred to it, by the free and mutual consent of both parties concerned, like a chamber of commerce; and is to have no more power to enforce its decisions than an ecclesiastical court in this country (p. 34).

Further on in his essay he discusses Sully's "Great Design," and notes the impossibility of any union of states for the purpose of enforcing compliance with international law. The real object of the project, which Henry IV of France supported, for a union of the nations of Europe, though "uncertain," was possibly, Ladd remarks, "defence against the encroachment of Mohammedan nations on Christendom—probably the humbling of the house of Austria" (p. 45). The object of defence or conquest, which is still the only possible basis for a firm union of independent states, is thus indicated. Referring to the effects of the adoption of the plan, Ladd continues:

> The condition of mankind, probably, would not have been immediately much ameliorated; for they might have lost as much in liberty as they would have gained in a peace compelled by the power of the sword and great standing armies, always dangerous to liberty and the favorite instrument of tyrants (p. 45).

As much may be said for the present proposals for a League of Nations. If the Entente Allies and the United States desired to enter into an alliance, through fear of German efficiency or aggression, we should have the necessary basis for a league, and a title of a League of Nations for the Purpose of Enforcing Peace, or Respect for International Law, would be one of those euphemisms in which the Anglo-Saxon world delights. It would have the additional advantage of glossing over our departure from the traditional policy of the United States of holding aloof from entangling alliances. Germany even now seems to recognize the threatening danger which this movement may hold for her future security. A press report from Berlin (*World*, November 1, 1916) announces that Professor Delbrück, the distinguished German statesman and editor of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, has called attention to Germany's error in not evincing more sympathy towards the suggestion of the other Powers for the extension of obligatory arbitration. Now comes the German Chancellor and declares that Germany may be expected to join a league of the nations to enforce peace. After so hearty a response to and acceptance of the proposed League, it would be a *reductio ad absurdum* for the other Powers to refuse Germany's coöperation. With Germany's inclusion in the League, however, it would embrace all the great nations of the world and be subject to the same disrupting political currents which are an inevitable feature of the international situation. Consequently the League, like the Holy Alliance, would burst asunder after a few years, or would become a political machine for coercing the minority. So long as it was wisely administered in accordance with the true alignment of forces, the League would preserve its position of a world government, but upon the first occasion when it misjudged the strength of the opposing political tendencies, it would topple over, and great would be the fall thereof. Humanity would be lucky if the temple of civilization did not fall about its head.

The advocates of the scheme do their best to parry the force of the opposing arguments by designating the action of the proposed League as "*prevention*" instead of "*compulsion*," but a change of language cannot alter the underlying principle which still remains compulsion in one of its forms; compulsory arbitration or compulsory mediation, sometimes designated as "conciliation," and the instances when it is proper to compel recourse to "conciliation" must be left to the political discretion of the contracting states.

It is lamentable that philanthropists should waste their effort and by advocating an impossibility withdraw public attention from needs more pressing for the advancement of civilization. By the education of public opinion we can surely obtain on the part of governments a wider recourse to the method of arbitration for the settlement of international differences. In 1840 Ladd remarked: "I believe that even now, *public opinion* is amply sufficient to enforce all the decisions of a Court of Nations, and the 'schoolmaster is abroad,' and public opinion is daily obtaining more power . . . It is therefore necessary, only to enlighten public opinion still farther, to insure the success of our plan" (p. 77). Students of international affairs would find it difficult to point out any instance where a great civilized Power has failed to comply with an arbitral award. As has been well said, the trouble is not with the medicine, but with the failure to take it.

Ladd terminates his prophetic proposal by a quotation from St. Pierre. He says: "The only supposition which we have made is that mankind have sense enough, in general, to know what is useful to them, and fortitude enough to embrace the means of their own happiness." In these few words he has set forth the problem of saving mankind from its folly. With its tendency to believe what it wishes, mankind ever seeks a royal road for the elimination of its ills. Constantly taught by new disappointments, it finds at last that the surer method of education gives the best results. Let our would-be reformers turn their energies into a propaganda for the widest possible voluntary adoption of international arbitration and international mediation or conciliation; let them further study and facilitate the development of the more recent forms of international coöperation, such as the periodic meetings of the Hague Conference and the formation of international unions. The basic principles of international law need to be proclaimed to all intelligent men; above all, we require the widest extension of publicity for governmental acts. Here is a programme certain to bring forth fruitful results. The panacea

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a world state, on the contrary, is doomed to bitter disappointment. A political unification of the nations of the world is impossible while political questions divide mankind. Our own national union is only possible because of the existence of rival nations, and even in our own national state we are divided into two great political groups which have only recently contended for the chief control. How and when the law shall be enforced borders upon the realm of politics. Our own internal differences of opinion as to the merits of obligatory arbitration in labor disputes should give us caution in dogmatizing about compulsion or "prevention" in the more extended arena of international affairs.

Academic Freedom of Utterance

AN ANALOGY DRAWN FROM JUDICIAL IMMUNITY.

By JOHN H. WIGMORE.*

In the settlement of the principles of academic freedom of utterance the student of law, it appears, can contribute one prime concept, which is never emphasized and seldom noticed by those who discuss the subject from the standpoint of general experience only. That contribution is found in the principle of the judge's immunity from civil action by a party claiming to have been wrongfully treated by the judge. The analogy of this legal principle, in its ultimate basis, to the immunity of university scholars is so striking that it cannot be ignored. And the practical limitations to be deduced from it are so marked that they merit careful consideration.

I.

To understand the force of the analogy, we may look at the rule of law. It is a time-honored principle, rooted now for three centuries,† that a Superior or Supreme judge is not liable to civil action, on any ground whatever, for a wrong done by him while acting on matters within his jurisdiction and as a judge. This rule is universally acknowledged throughout Anglo-American law‡—an unusual feature of a legal rule, and a sufficient testimony to the obviousness and solidity of this rule.

Note the extremeness of the protection. It concedes two circumstances that make the protection almost incredibly strong. It assumes, first, that the judge's order or ruling, by which the complainant has actually suffered, may have been issued contrary to the law of the land, an order resulting perhaps in an imprisonment of the person or a deprivation of his property, however extensive or however unjustifiable in law. It assumes, secondly, that the judge may have made his ruling or order with personal malice or fraud, or under the corrupt influence of a bribe. And assuming even these things, the rule nevertheless firmly grants immunity to the judge: "The proposition," said Lord Esher, in a modern English case,* "is true to its fullest extent, that no action lies for acts done or words spoken by a judge in the exercise of his judicial office, although his motive is malicious, and the acts or words are not done or spoken in the honest exercise of his office. If a judge goes beyond his jurisdiction, a different set of considerations arise."†

The policy of the rule is simple; and it has been expounded many times in weighty opinions. As neat a statement as any, in brief compass, is that of Mr. Justice Field, in Bradley v. Fisher:‡

> If civil actions could be maintained in such cases against the judge, because the losing party should see fit to allege in his complaint that the acts of the judge were done with partiality, or maliciously, or corruptly, the protection essential to judicial independence would be entirely swept away. Few persons, sufficiently irritated to institute an action against a judge for his judicial acts, would hesitate to ascribe any character to the acts which would be essential to the maintenance of an action. If upon such allegations a judge could be compelled to answer in a civil action for his judicial acts, . . . he would be subjected for his protection to the necessity of . . . showing the judge before whom he might be summoned by the losing party . . . that he had decided as he did with judicial integrity. And the second judge would be subjected to a similar burden in his turn.

In other words, were the rule otherwise, for the sake of reaching the one judge in a hundred who might act corruptly or maliciously, then the ninety-and-nine honest and competent judges would be likely to be harassed continually by complainants *alleging* this malice or corruptness as a nominal pretext for their claim. And the profound ill-consequence is obvious. The honest judge's peace of mind would be gone.

II.

The analogy is plain. The object of academic immunity is the protection of the competent thinker in that unhampered research and discussion which alone leads to the discovery of scientific truth. But the protection cannot be limited to the competent thinker. It must extend to all academic scholars, including the incompetent, the extremists, the radicals, the temperamentally biassed, and the tactless. For otherwise it is easy enough to find the charge brought that the particular supposed offender *is* incompetent, or tactless, or whatever else it is that falls outside the line of protection. His case is precisely like that of the judge in this respect. The offended party—be he trustee, regent, editor, ecclesiastic, parent, or man in the street—is always likely to allege that the doctrine advanced by the academic incumbent, or the manner of advancing it, is such as reveals plainly the academic man's incompetence to be a professor of true science or a safe guide of youth. And, in fact, almost all of the instances publicly discussed do exhibit precisely that feature. The parallel is almost amusingly exact. Citations are needless; read any of the documents recently published in any of the instances.

If we do not appreciate this aspect of the problem, we are in danger of ignoring entirely the real basis for defending academic freedom. That basis is that it is impossible to protect the competent scholar, who by general concession merits protection both in the substance and in the form of his utterances, without also protecting the incompetent one, who in himself alone might be said not to merit protection; because, if a line of definition be attempted, the offended party will always believe and allege that the supposed offender falls outside that line, and thus the whole class of competent men will always be hampered in their research and their utterances by the likelihood of being required to defend themselves against this allegation.

III.

What practical limitations follow from the foregoing principle? It follows, in the first place, that there should be no line of distinction between the radical and the orthodox tenor of the utterance, the competence or incompetence of the man as a scholar, or the tactful or tactless manner of the utterance. Qualifications and distinctions of this sort, making concessions to the opponents of academic freedom, abound in recent discussions of the subject. But they are concessions wasted. Any distinctions of that sort are words thrown away. Be very sure that the fault-finders will always discover the very fault which you have conceded not to be immune. To make such a concession is to concede one's third line of defence; it

---

*Professor of Law in Northwestern University and President (1916) of the American Association of University Professors.

†*Floyd* v. *Barker*, 1608, 12 Coke Rep. 23; *Bushel's Case*, 1670, Vaughan 138; *Miller* v. *Seare*, 1771, 2 Wm. Blackstone 1141.

‡"It has been the settled doctrine of the English courts for many centuries, and has never been denied, that we are aware of, in the courts of this country. It has, as Chancellor Kent observes, 'a deep root in the common law.' "—Field, J., in *Bradley* v. *Fisher*, 13 Wallace 336 (1871).

*Anderson v. Gorrie [1895] 1 Queen's Bench 668.

†The following colloquy ensued in that case: The plaintiff said to the Master of the Rolls, "Then if your lordship were to order a policeman in court to bring to you on the bench a man from the body of the court, and your lordship were then to strike the man in the face, would the striking be a judicial act?" And his lordship replied that it would be a judicial act. . . . On August 7, reverting to the point your petitioner had submitted, as to whether striking a man in the face would be a judicial act, Lord Esher said: "*If I were to order a barrister in court to sit down*, and he did not, and I *shot at him and killed him*, I much doubt if proceedings for murder would lie against me." (From a letter by the complainant, printed afterwards in the London *Truth*.)

‡13 Wallace, 336 (1871). In that case, Jos. H. Bradley, one of the counsel defending John H. Surratt, tried for the murder of President Lincoln, had been disbarred by Justice Fisher, of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, for insulting language addressed to him in court. Bradley brought an action for $20,000 damages, and alleged that the judge's act was done "falsely, fraudulently, maliciously, and corruptly." The Federal Supreme Court, refusing to inquire into the truth of this allegation, held the action not maintainable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is better to refuse it, and to claim frankly and unreservedly the full scope of that protection which is necessary for all.

But, secondly, the analogy of judicial immunity points out a very real limitation, namely, the scholar should be protected only so long as he keeps within his own jurisdiction. Just as the judicial immunity protects a probate judge in probate matters only, a chancery judge in chancery matters only, and a criminal judge in those criminal cases only which by law are allotted to him, so the scholar must not expect protection if he goes outside of the field to which he is appointed.

The reason here is plain. The protection is not given for his personal sake, but for Truth's sake. "Let Truth and Falsehood grapple," said John Milton; "who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter? She needs no policies nor stratagems nor licensings, to make her victorious. These are the shifts and defences that Error uses against her power." And so, as each of us has received a part only of the field of Truth to cultivate, and is charged with thus much only of a duty to seek and to speak freely, our protection is not needed outside of that part of the field.

In actual application these boundary lines are often hard to draw. In economics, for instance, who shall say whether a certain topic is merely current State politics, and not the science of economics? But, nevertheless, the principle is a valid one; and as a postulate for assisting in decision it must be recognized. And, for most purposes, its application is plain enough. If, for example, a lecturer on corporation law publishes an article supporting the propriety of Judge Landis's imposition of the $27,000,000 fine in the Standard Oil case, he is strictly and plainly within his own field of academic freedom. And when another, lecturing in international law, expounds the propriety of President Cleveland's message to Great Britain on its interference in Venezuela, he is within his jurisdiction, let the winds of offended sentiment howl as they may. The scholar's immunity is conditioned on his keeping within his jurisdiction.

Thirdly, the analogy of judicial immunity points to another real limitation; namely, the utterance must have been made while doing some act of the strictly academic function, oral or written. This, of course, includes, first, all classroom utterances, and, next, all publications in books or journals of a professional nature. On the other hand, it plainly excludes utterances made on the stump in a political campaign, and interviews published in a general newspaper. In the interval fall a number of arguable cases —paid articles in popular magazines, addresses in public lecture courses, casual addresses outside of the lecture-room but in academic groves, partisan action as a citizen, and so on.

The reason for this limitation is also plain. The university places us here to pursue the search for truth; and the necessary places for the needful discussions are the classroom and the professional publication. The protection *must* extend to them, and to places like them; but it need go no further. But (we shall hear a protest) must a man, then, give up his freedom of utterance as a citizen merely because he is a university professor? Shall he have less liberty as a citizen than a plumber or a banker or a lawyer? This is an ancient argument; but it is none the better for that. Of course, he is to have less liberty. Unquestionably he gave up some of his liberty as a citizen when he accepted his university position. Why? Because he received a special privilege over and above the ordinary citizen —his university immunity; and it is not unfair that he should relinquish something in exchange.

It should be borne in mind that this academic immunity signifies that the appointive powers have abdicated something which all appointive powers in other walks of life claim and retain in full force—and retain by general acquiescence, if not by moral right. The banker is not expected to bear with the bank-clerk who advocates the heresy of free silver. The tin-plate manufacturer could not be asked to keep an employee who denounced the tariff on tin-plate. No men having legal or economic powers are expected to continue employing those who champion antagonistic views.

The trustees, the regents, and the presidents, it is true, are not employers of the faculties; they hold a public trust, not to be exercised according to private interests or personal views. And nothing is more offensive or more indicative of a crude view and a philistine attitude than the word "employ," as occasionally used by such officers in referring to their relation to the faculties. Nevertheless, it is a fact of everyday life that the person holding appointive powers does expect some substantial harmony of views with his on the part of those who are subject to that power. And this actual limitation on our general activity as thinkers is what disappears when we accept university positions. The university appointive authorities, as trustees for Truth, are properly deemed to abdicate that kind of power which they otherwise would feel entitled to exercise. That is what academic immunity means. And that is why we may fairly be deemed to give up part of that freedom of utterance and action as citizens, in return for the absolute immunity of utterance which we receive as members of the university body.

It is something like the immunity of the clerics in the Middle Ages. The churchman dedicated himself to works of God; and, in so doing, he received an immunity from military service, from civil taxation, and from that liability to maintain himself by temporal violence which was the common lot of the burghers and the peasant in those days. As a man of God, he became immune. But, in return, he must abstain from temporal methods; he must put away weapons, and he must confine himself to the duties of the Church. This analogy is valuable only as illustrating that, in the conscience of mankind, it is not unnatural to find that one who dedicates himself to a career which carries great immunities must expect to pay a price, and to sacrifice something of that precarious liberty which otherwise he had.

The moral is that the professor must frankly resign himself to forego some of the exceptional modes of civic utterance, if he is to insist upon that absolute immunity which is granted to him for the sake of his research after Truth in his chosen field. A glance at the notorious cases of the last decade will show that some of them have been due solely to the professors' failure to recognize this just limitation. A notable instance is that university in a Rocky Mountain State where a professor of law accepted a position on a campaign committee of the Progressive party. May we not as well concede, then, that in general the true basis of academic freedom imports a practical prohibition upon professors to lend their authority on controversial themes in ephemeral newspaper interviews, or to take active leadership in a purely partisan political campaign?

IV.

The problem is to define the limits of this restriction. For, of course, it is only a partial one and by no means a total prohibition. The professor does not, and need not, surrender his ordinary freedom of utterance as a citizen, a taxpayer, a neighbor, or a church-member. Take the following examples from real life: A professor who has suffered repeated annoyance through the shortcomings of the local gas company, and has complained repeatedly, but in vain, writes a letter to the superintendent threatening resort to the courts for redress. The superintendent speaks to a bank cashier about the recalcitrant professor; and the cashier mentions the matter to a trustee, who asks the professor to withdraw his complaint. It is not a fair proceeding to put pressure in this way on the professor in his personal rights. Or, again, a professor of law writes to the Governor, naming grounds of serious objection to a proposed nominee for a judgeship. The Governor shows the letter to a Senator, who sends word to a prominent lawyer who is a trustee, and the trustee expostulates with the professor. This is an undue interference with ordinary civic liberty.

The recent incident in Michigan is another example of undue interference. Certain professors of the State University had signed the declaration of the American Rights Committee (published on April 17), containing a statement of opinion on the moral merits of the parties to the great war, and of the attitude of American public opinion. To each signature was added the occupation and residence of the signer; and therefore to the professors' names was added the title of their department in the university. A Congressman of that State sent to the president of the University a protest "against their action in signing as pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessors of the University in such unneutral endeavor; these men have no right to use the name of the University in any such movement." The Congressman's view is intolerable. A citizen has as great a right to identify himself by naming his occupation as professor in a university as has any one else to name his occupation as president of a bank or manager of a plough works. A man is not to be muzzled the moment he becomes a professor. And the Congressman's dispatch of his telegram to the president of the University, instead of to the signers themselves, was merely an insidious attempt to put pressure on the professors. If such attempts were common, it would be better to vindicate necessary liberties by denying any limitations at all. It is more important that professors should retain their ordinary civic liberties than that they should give up those special activities which are open to doubt. But a line can be drawn practically. What I desire here to emphasize is merely the theoretical ground for conceding that the exercise of some special extremes of such liberty may be regarded as surrendered.

To conclude: The argument from analogy, based on the legal rule of judicial immunity, is valid and significant for the principle of academic freedom, because the human nature of the situation is very nearly the same, and because the legal principle has for three centuries stood the test of experience and received universal support. May its dictates some day become equally universal and unquestioned in the field of university life!

Correspondence

DISCIPLINE IN AMERICA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The letter written on "Discipline and Democracy," by Mr. Wells, of Philadelphia, is very interesting, but I think that if he looks into the subject carefully his ideas on improving these untrained youths would take too long. Except for a very few, there is no such thing as self-imposed discipline among our native-born American youths of to-day. The public schools, in my judgment, are a failure, and very often boys come out worse than when they enter. Therefore, military training should be put into force in all the States, and, I take it, when that is done, our youths will be better and more useful citizens.

Richard Sears.

Boston, November 3.

THE FREUDIAN "MESS."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: There are several reasons why psychologists have been unwilling to mix in the Freudian mess besides a healthy objection to nastiness in general. One of these reasons is nicely expressed by the revered Yves Delage in the current number of the *Bulletin de l'Institut Général Phychologique* (Janvier-Juin, 1916). He says:

"A notre avis, si dans toutes les psychoanalyses on trouve cette abondance de complexes sexuels d'où est sortie l'idée du pansexualisme, c'est parceque les psychoanalystes se sont recrutés surtout parmi ceux chez lesquels ces complexes étaient les plus actifs. Il y a, en effet, dans la pratique de la psychoanalyse une occasion fréquente de donner l'essor a ses complexes sexuels sous le déguisement sincère et honnête de la pratique médicale."

An *argumentum ad hominem* on this subject is not one that most people would care to make. Nevertheless, I presume it is an opinion that not a few psychologists have, and that they will not be sorry to have it voiced by a physiologist of the age and reputation of Delage.

Frank Angell.

Stanford University, October 25.

"THE PRENTE OF SEINTE VENUS SEEL."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir:

> Gat-tothed I was, and that bicam me weel,
> I hadde the prente of Seinte Venus seel.
> —The Prologe of the Wyues Tale of Bathe, 603-4.

Students of Chaucer will be interested in a paper read by Mr. D. C. Hesseling, professor of Greek in the University of Leiden, before the members of the Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, in Amsterdam. He deals with the popular superstitions that gave rise to the Homeric phrase ἕρκος ὀδόντων. In the ninth book of the Iliad Achilles values his ψυχή higher than all the treasures of Troy or Delphi, for treasures can be captured, but the soul that once has passed the ἕρκος ὀδόντων cannot be recovered. With quotations from modern Greek novels Mr. Hesseling proves the survival in Greece of the popular belief that the teeth can prevent the soul from escaping. "If I knew that my Vasilis would return within a week, I should detain my soul with my teeth," says a dying mother in a novel by Christovasilis. That accounts for the modern Greek proverb ἀριὰ δόντια ὀλιγόχρονος: "Gap-toothed, short-lived." But gaps in the "wall of teeth" are responsible for more than premature death. In the Greek periodical *Laographia* (iii., p. 510), Chatziotis tells of a superstition prevalent at Argalaste, not far from Magnesia, according to which people with gaping teeth are predestined to contract a second marriage. To appreciate the full meaning of this conviction, Mr. Hesseling observes, one must remember that the Greek Church regards a second marriage as a deplorable concession to the weakness of human nature, for which the priest, at the ceremony, is to invoke the divine mercy. This modern Greek superstition affords an interesting parallel to Chaucer's description of the "Gat-tothed wif of Bath," of whom the poet tells us that "housbondes at chirche-dore she hadde fyue." It does away with Skeat's explanation of "gat-tothed" as "a sign that the person will be lucky and travel much." Mr. Hesseling offers a very plausible suggestion. Among primitive peoples, in various parts of the world, the practice prevails of cutting out a couple of front teeth of boys and girls, but especially of the latter, when they reach the age of puberty. The likeliest explanation of this ceremony is that by this gap in the wall of teeth a passage was made for the magic vivifying fluid which is believed to be the real cause of procreation, the "Hauchseele" as it is called by Wundt ("Mythus und Religion," pp. 56 ff), or "Zeugungshauch" in the terminology of Preuss ("Der Ursprung der Religion und Kunst," p. 362). Hence women who, like the wife of Bath, were gap-toothed by nature were believed to be predestined for the office of love. They bore "the prente of Seinte Venus seel."

A. J. Barnouw.

The Hague, Holland, November 10.

Notes from the Capital

NEWTON DIEHL BAKER.

A few years ago I was requested to join in promoting a movement for the restoration of the three-cent piece to our national coinage. As it seemed to me that the system was already sufficiently diversified to meet all actual needs, and bearing in mind the dismal fate of the two-cent piece, I declined. The prime engineer of the enterprise was a young man named Newton Diehl Baker, who was described to me as the "Three-Cent Mayor" of Cleveland, Ohio. He had taken up—and, more to the point, had carried through—the campaign of his immediate predecessor in office, Tom L. Johnson, for three-cent fares on the local street railways, and was then, I believe, pushing his further plan of placing the city lighting system upon a three-cent-per-kilowatt-hour basis. He had even invaded the popular amusement field, to provide municipal dance-houses in which the young people of the city could, under reputable auspices, glide through the giddy mazes a whole evening for three cents a head.

The next thing I heard of him was when, at Baltimore in 1912, he persuaded the Democratic National Convention to trample upon the traditional sanctity of the unit rule, and recognize the right of the Wilson men in the Ohio delegation to ignore their instructions and vote their preference, thus throwing to Wilson twenty-one out of Ohio's forty-eight votes, which but for him would have been cast solidly for Harmon. Soon after Wilson's victory at the polls the following autumn, it became common knowledge in Washington that Baker had received an offer of a Cabinet portfolio but declined it, not because his sympathetic interest in the coming Administration had waned, but because he felt that his first duty was to his home city, which he was straining every nerve to modernize according to a programme he had thought out. With his final retirement from its service as Mayor, however, President Wilson pounced upon him again, and this time succeeded in drawing him into the Executive household as Secretary of War.

This seemed, at a first glance, like the wildest of incongruities, for Baker was known everywhere as a pacifist, and what was to be expected of a devotee of peace in an office which dealt wholly with military concerns and exploited war even in its title? He soon showed, by publicly distinguishing between a war of aggression and a war of defence. For the latter, he was in favor of a force of a million troops—half of these to be composed of the regular army and its militia reserve, the other half of citizens who had received a specified training in arms. He believed in preparedness, he said, because in these days no nation could depend, in a vital emergency, on a body of embattled farmers equipped with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rude firearms which were adequate a few decades ago; and to this end he insisted that we must mobilize all our resources, including our industries and commerce. For instance, he added, "I have no doubt that every manufacturing plant in this country could be so related to a central bureau of the Government that its special usefulness in time of need would be known in advance, its wheels ready to turn in response to the demand of a public crisis, and its proprietors willing to forego any speculative profits while they made their contribution, in common with the rest of the people, toward the preservation of the nation."

If you wish to hear these views expanded and expounded from his own lips, you must prepare for a surprise to the eyes. This philosopher is no bearded ancient, but to all appearance, until you have studied his lines carefully, a recent high-school graduate. The only thing in the bodily outfit of Baker which is at all consistent with his maturity of thought and largeness of expression is his head, which is so big in proportion to his insignificant frame as to suggest topheaviness. The brow is prominent, especially at the temples. The eyes are hazel-brown in color, and reflective rather than forceful. The mouth, which is large and absolutely horizontal, seems well adapted to hold the seasoned pipe he likes to carry in it. The hair is dark, straight, and of good quantity—about what usually goes with so sallow a complexion. In his favorite attitude of attention to a visitor, leaning back in his chair with one leg drawn up under him and the other foot not reaching the floor, he may strike you as uncanny until he begins to speak. Then you can think of nothing but a firing squad condensed into one man: his words rattle out into space with such rapidity that, unless your hearing is good and your reasoning faculties are active, you are hardly able to keep up with them. If you do, you will be impressed with the comprehensiveness of his vocabulary. He is never at a loss for a word, and, when it comes, it conveys the precise shade of meaning he evidently wished it to. Almost his only gesture is a raised forefinger.

During the recent campaign, by the by, Baker suffered not a little from his alarming facility of utterance; for, according to his story, the blunder of a slow stenographer, by turning "sold" into "stole," made him appear, in a political speech, to portray the patriot army of the American Revolution as a mere horde of irresponsible vagabonds. This was a sad accident for him, as it brought down upon him the reprobation of a good many excellent people who will never take the trouble to look into the whole story. Most of the accidents which have beset Baker's career have had fortunate results. It was accident that sent him, a West Virginia country boy, to Johns Hopkins University just at the time when Woodrow Wilson was delivering there a course of lectures on political history and economics, the young student's favorite topic; and accident again threw him for a considerable period into the same boarding-house, and assigned him a seat at the same table, with the lecturer. It was the accident of his small stature and lack of robustness which separated him from the common juvenile sports and led him to seek an outlet for his energies through scholarship and the cultivation of his elocutionary powers. It was the accident of being needed in Washington as secretary to Postmaster-General Wilson which gave him his first intimate glimpse, and from the inside, of the great governmental machine. It was accident that led him to overhear, and plunge into, a wrangle between two strangers, and thus captivate the fancy of one of them, Martin Foran, a leading lawyer of Cleveland, who astonished him by taking him at once into partnership. And it was his removal to Cleveland that brought him into the wake of that intellectual prize-fighter, Johnson, whose influence shaped his entire life thereafter.

Baker is so unlike anything we have been accustomed to regard as Cabinet material that it is hard to estimate justly his human quality or public value. None of the ordinary standards of measurement seem to fit him. A radical renovator of corporations, who nevertheless aims to remember that unoffending stockholders have rights and equities like other persons, is a curiosity; a publicist who condemns militarism, yet is ready to accept the expert judgment of professional fighters as to the extent of the armament with which the nation should provide itself, is equally uncommon; a citizen who accepts a great office at a critical juncture with the distinct stipulation that he shall be allowed to lay it down again after a year's service, is a political eccentric. For the present, we must be content to regard Baker as a puzzle, particularly as it is always open to doubt whether a man who thinks so rapidly and speaks so torrentially as he is as safe as one with more deliberate mentality and tongue; but doubtless, in this era of incessant change, we shall not have to wait very long for the crucial test needed to assure us whereabout he belongs on the scale of statesmanship. TATTLER.

Literature

INDIAN AND WHITE MAN.

From the Deep Woods to Civilization. By Charles A. Eastman (Ohiyesa). Boston: Little, Brown & Co. $2 net.

This book, like its predecessors from the same pen, is autobiographical. It deals with the adolescent and maturer life of the author of "Indian Boyhood," and suffers not a little from that fact; for the account of his childish experiences had for its background the social conditions and atmosphere of the original camp into which his birth ushered him and in which he was entirely at home, whereas the record of his later activities is given to us in a setting to which, notwithstanding his two-score years passed in close contact with white civilization, he remains still very slenderly attached. A racial—perhaps it would be more accurate to say a tribal—strain of morbidness, which reveals itself at intervals in all his writing, is somewhat tiresomely obvious in this latest effort. His acceptance of our civilization is far from an embrace; it is rather the arm's-length, sharply critical tolerance that is to be noted in the Dakota tribesmen as contrasted with the Indians farther to the southward or on the west coast. Some of his early impressions of Christianity, to which his father had become converted before the author came to know him, are interesting. The twain had occasion to make a journey together through the then wild country of the upper Mississippi Valley, and, we are told:

> One of the first things I observed was my father's reading aloud from a book every morning and evening, followed by a very strange song and a prayer. Although all he said was in Indian, I did not understand it fully. He apparently talked aloud to the "Great Mystery," asking for our safe guidance back to his home in the States. The first reading of this book of which I have any recollection was the twenty-third Psalm, and the first hymn he sang in my presence was to the old tune of Ortonville. . . . I had been taught to seek the "Great Mystery" in silence, in the deep forest or on the height of the mountain.

And when the youth went to the mission school conducted by Dr. Alfred Riggs at Santee, Neb., he was treated to more surprises:

> Our principal read aloud from a large book and offered prayer. Although he conducted devotional exercises in the Sioux language, the subject-matter was still strange, and the names he used were unintelligible to me. "Jesus" and "Jehovah" fell upon my ears as mere meaningless sounds.
>
> I understood that he was praying to the "Great Mystery" that the work of the day might be blessed and their labor be fruitful. A cold sweat came out upon me as I heard him ask the "Great Mystery" to be with us in that day's work in that school building. I thought it was too much to ask of Him. I had been taught that the Supreme Being is only concerned with spirits, and that when one wishes to commune with Him in nature he must be in a spiritual attitude, and must retire from human sound or influence, alone in the wilderness. Here for the first time I heard Him addressed openly in the presence of a house full of young men and young girls.

His introduction to strictly family worship was in a sod dwelling where he stayed overnight as the guest of a pioneer household while making a long tramp across-country. He had gone out after supper to seat himself on the bank of a stream and meditate, when—

> —presently there pealed forth a peculiar, weird music, and the words of a strange song. It was music from a melodeon, but I did not then know what that was, and the tune was "Nearer, my God, to Thee." Strange as it sounded to me, I felt that there was something soothing and gentle about the music and the voices.
>
> After a while curiosity led me back to the sod house, and I saw for the first time how the white woman pumps so much air into a box that when she presses on the top boards it howls convulsively. I forgot my bashfulness so far as to listen openly and enjoy the operation, wondering much how the white man puts a pair of lungs into a box, which is furnished with a whole set of black and white teeth, and when he sings to it, it appears to answer him.

Eastman's story of the so-called Ghost Dance war of 1890 is, of course, told from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Indian side, and differs in some respects from the version long familiar in the East. As he puts it, the whole affair grew out of a harmless religious revival among the Indians, which, had it been prudently and tactfully handled, might have expended its force through natural channels, but which, owing in part to the nervous apprehensiveness of the Government functionaries on the Pine Ridge reservation, and in part to an ill-timed attempt to arrest an Indian accused of some minor offence, whose defiance of the police brought about a clash, resulted in a needless waste of lives. The last sad act of the tragedy, however—the bloody day at Wounded Knee—was plainly, from his account, the outcome of Sitting Bull's resistance to arrest, and some of the painful aftermath, at least, was the direct consequence of Indian excitement and rashness.

Eastman's service as a physician under the Indian Bureau faced him with the problem of getting along peaceably with the native conjurers already on the ground. He succeeded in reaching a friendly footing with them through making the first advances himself, and giving them the satisfaction of apparently making a voluntary concession to him, while at the same time they actually accepted his view of the treatment of patients whom they were simultaneously summoned to attend. His estimate places the Indian medicine-man in the same general category with the mental healer or Christian Scientist of white communities. "The medicine man," he says, "was all of that, and, further, he practiced massage or osteopathy, used the Turkish bath, and some useful vegetable remedies. But his main hold on the minds of the people was gained through his appeals to the spirits and his magnetic and hypnotic powers."

Two-thirds of the book before us follows the author through various experiences among his fellow-Indians, and these have passages of considerable liveliness and interest, for reasons already suggested. The concluding third continues the story from the point where he undertook to establish himself in independent private practice, and most of the color drops out of the narrative, as if the details rather wearied him in their rehearsal because his heart was not in them. He appears not to have held to any one plan very persistently, and in due course he found himself back in the Government service again, working at the task of straightening out the Indian family histories and giving the members of every family separate and permanent names like those of the whites around them. All this part, moreover, concerns itself chiefly with the author's individual plans and acts, and much of it is written in a tone of self-appreciation, or of complaint of others whose character or conduct did not approve itself to him. Here and there, only, it is relieved by a cheerful gleam, as where, having settled down in Washington as lobbyist for Indian legislation and claims, and thus having to convoy visiting red men to the places and persons they wished to see, he took note of their characteristic comments. Young-Man-Afraid-of-His-Horses described President Harrison as "a man of the old trail; he will never make a new one"; and when White Ghost met this with the remark that "there is a strong religious principle in him," American Horse responded: "The missionaries tell us that a man cannot have two masters; then how can he be a religious man and a politician at the same time?"

Of President McKinley, Littlefish said: "He has a bigger heart than most white men, and this is unfortunate for him. The white man is a man of business, and has no use for a heart." John Grass pronounced Grover Cleveland the bravest white chief he had ever known, because "the harder you press him the stronger he stands." Spotted Horse was much impressed by President Roosevelt, paying him the definite compliment of saying: "While he talked, I forgot that he was a white man!" Senator Platt, of Connecticut, the Indians picked out as "very cautious and a diplomat." Senator Tillman puzzled them, but on the whole they concluded that he was "a fighting man, governed by his emotions rather than his judgment."

Dr. Eastman sums up his worldly philosophy as to our social order thus: "When I reduce civilization to its lowest terms, it becomes a system of life based upon trade. The dollar is the measure of value, and 'might' still spells 'right'; otherwise, why war? Yet even in deep jungles God's own sunlight penetrates, and I stand before my people still as an advocate of civilization. Why? First, because there is no chance for our former simple life any more; and, secondly, because I realize that the white man's religion is not responsible for his mistakes."

CURRENT FICTION.

The Vermilion Box. By E. V. Lucas. New York: George H. Doran Co.

Mr. Lucas is one of the very few writers in English who can make effective use of the epistolary form. Here he takes a group of people, most of them connected or destined to be connected by ties of blood or marriage, and sets them at writing the letters of war-time one to another. The artistic unity of the correspondence is conserved by the letters of Richard Haven, the bachelor uncle of the younger members of the group, the brother or son or "in-law," as the case may be, of the elders. Others of the *dramatis personæ* are as their individual characters require; Richard Haven is reserved for the mouthpiece of the author, speaking with wisdom and urbanity of the human side of the war as England sees it. The result is perhaps the most delightful of the lighter volumes inspired by the war that have come to us. Of its genre it is as noteworthy as "Mr. Britling Sees It Through." Mr. Wells wrestles strenuously with his soul, passing from fever to fever, in his struggle to see it through to something fundamental; Mr. Lucas, in the person of his middle-aged bachelor, keeps his head and his sense of humor and urges his correspondents to do the same. Britling, imaginative creature, twists and dodges through a maelstrom of opposing tides of traffic to one of those safety islands provided for the convenience of nervous pedestrians; Richard Haven paces serenely along the sidewalk, not indifferent to the commotion of the street, but viewing it as a transitory spectacle and commenting pungently on its lighter aspects. There is no lack of tenderness or of deep feeling in these letters, and in their way they give as true a reflection of English types under the test of war as is to be found in Mr. Wells's book, but most felicitously the author of "Cloud and Silver" bids us look here on the penumbra of the struggle rather than on its darker aspects. Thus among the actual records of war which Mr. Lucas incorporates in his volume (and some were apparently so actual that they have been excised by the Census Bureau) is a delicious ditty which has been revived for service in the trenches, and which, together with Richard Haven's comment, we select for quotation from a wealth of quotable material:

> The Bells of Hell go ting-a-ling-a-ling
> For you, but not for me.
> For me the angels sing-a-ling-a-ling;
> They've got the goods for me.
> O Death, where is thy sting-a-ling-a-ling?
> O Grave thy victoree?
> The Bells of Hell go ting-a-ling-a-ling
> For you, but not for me!

Isn't that wonderful? and incredible? It is not exactly religion, and yet it is religion. Fatalism with faith. Assurance with disdain. The very aristocracy of confidence. And only the new British soldier could sing it.

The Guiding Thread. By Beatrice Harraden. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co.

An English scholar has married a maiden out of a village smithy—as 'twere—and made what he considers a very satisfactory wife out of her. For years they have lived in all but complete isolation—two souls with but a single thought and that the Italian Renaissance—when the young wife, in the course of a chance excursion into London, hears neatly worded opinions, literary and political, vociferated by the parrot hung in a bird fancier's doorway: "Thomas Hardy forever! . . . Cecil Rhodes great man!" That night, at her husband's request, she was reading aloud from her notebook sage pronouncements upon Savonarola, when "she broke off suddenly. The green notebook which she had been clutching convulsively in her intense excitement dropped from her right hand. . . . She seemed to be listening to some sound. . . . She beat her breast. 'The parrot! The parrot!' she said in a low voice, tense with secret suffering. Then with bowed head she left them."

Not long thereafter she burns the notebook, takes her pilgrim staff in hand, and leaves husband to get out his historical masterpiece as best he can alone. Through the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

village to London, New York, California, and thence home again runs her journey's round —the modern woman's cycle of emancipation and return to duty, if you please. How very, very hard and how very, very good it was for them both, this "little wild bird" of a wife "with healing in her wings" and this "anachronism" of a husband, no one who has not read the rhapsodic chronicle could possibly imagine. The sole diverting feature of the book is the author's sheer inability to assimilate the stark American scene into her idyllic scheme. Her wayfarer who in England laid her down to sleep in a stranger's garden and awoke to find "she had been covered up with a warm rug, and that milk, bread, and honey had been placed on a little table by the rustic seat," in New York has to be put "into the way of getting cheap meals at such places as Childs, and initiated into many contrivances for living economically by buying certain things from the delicatessen shops on Third Avenue, such as potato salad, baked beans, thin slices of cheese, and canned corn. And with oyster stew, coffee, and poached eggs, bread, butter, and oranges, hot tomato soup, and a plate of crackers for ten cents at a drug store, malted milk and chocolate with an egg 'shaken' into it and a plate of crackers for fifteen cents, and an occasional dinner at the 'Greek,' Joan got along very passably on about seventy-five cents a day."

Unhappy in Thy Daring. By Marius Lyle. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

For all the goodly number of individuals to be met in this story of a present-day Irish household, the reader may find in it, as on some Attic stage, only three actors and a chorus, and of the three he may perhaps "feel" only one character. One full-length portrait can hardly be fuller than another, yet Hester's married sister and the husband melt into such weakness in her hands that her most unlikely demise at the close seems to leave a pair of ghosts to their peace. Hester herself, from her first appearance and just up to the moment of her taking-off, is not to be denied. A more thoroughly unpleasant young woman it has seldom been our lot to meet. Missing a sense of womanly power, she wreaks herself on intellectual achievement, until her moral tastes, like Darwin's taste for poetry, fail her outright. These two advantages over her fellows, her finer mind and her blunter conscience, she devotes to the service of petty spite. She stumbles at nothing to defraud the sister both of her inheritance and of her husband's fidelity. The ugly young superwoman cheats consistently through the game of life without being called to account, until nature lays a trap for her and, with a ruthlessness almost comparable to her own, makes her a mother. A study in morbid psychology, a woman near of kin to a hobgoblin, she is none the less projected from the book, a creature vividly alive. Of the story as a whole, which is never overburdened with analysis, it must be confessed that the personalities of the victims hardly support the strain and are made too arbitrarily to contribute to the major effect. This one embodiment is so unwavering, however, that the aids it requires seem not to derogate from it, so that the reader would be hard put to it to charge Hester, as a portrait, with cheating. The story throughout moves on quietly, with an unaffected calm, and oddly lacks the least vestige of the subduing atmosphere of place.

THE LAND AND PEOPLE OF HOMER.

Homer and History. By Walter Leaf. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Dr. Leaf's book was to have been delivered in the form of lectures, after the fashion of Gilbert Murray's "Rise of the Greek Epic," at an American university, thanks to the generosity of an American banker. Though the war has prevented the delivery of the lectures, in their expanded form they bear the title of the N. W. Harris Lectures of Northwestern University, a cause for genuine congratulation to the University and a happy memorial to the donor.

Fully a quarter of a century ago Dr. Leaf announced the position which the present book supports. Homeric critics have been busy in the meantime, and the archæologists have made over the Homeric world. Yet he is able, despite the modifications which subsequent discoveries, especially those in Crete, have forced, to return with very potent arguments to his original thesis that the Homeric poems really do depict, as contemporaries, the Achaian age, as they profess. That he should be able to recur to a faith so long held and restate the old theme with fresh conviction, the author modestly attributes to the appearance of H. M. Chadwick's "The Heroic Age." The latter strengthens Leaf's arguments by analogy from the Teutonic world of literature, it is true, but the great interest of Leaf's book comes first and foremost from the author's profound knowledge of the poems themselves and all that they contain, and then from his familiarity with the land they describe. Few, if any, who are competent to judge will doubt the assertion that Leaf is the greatest Homeric scholar of his time. The present volume is marked by profound knowledge, but is still more interesting by reason of the fact that the author has employed a constructive imagination to bring back to us the world the poems describe. In this he and his book are to be compared to Gilbert Murray and "The Rise of the Greek Epic." The latter surpasses in the poetic quality of the picture; Leaf is to be preferred by reason of greater historic probability and sound judgment.

In 1795 Wolf published his famous Prolegomena. There followed a century of the most intense discussion among philologists; almost every possible theory was put forward in regard to the Homeric poems; the results were felt in many fields of literary criticism, particularly in that called, *par excellence*, the Higher Criticism. In 1893 Dörpfeld uncovered the Mycenæan walls at Hissarlik. Since then Homeric criticism has largely been a matter of the archæologist and the historian, especially since the finds in Crete have put an entirely new face on matters in the eastern Mediterranean world. Leaf gathers together the latest knowledge, adds it to his profound acquaintance with the poems themselves, and makes his survey of Homer and history.

He goes back for his beginning to Crete in its prime, say the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries before Christ. The artists and merchants of Knossos, secure in their great sea-power, were building the mighty palace and manufacturing and exporting their wares south and east. To the mainland of Greece to the northwest had penetrated through every open bay kinsmen who had firmly established themselves, by reason of their high civilization and their arms of bronze, as masters over the more primitive earlier inhabitants. The Minoan civilization of Crete, protected by the dominant sea-power, needed no great fortifications; transplanted to the mainland, it was confronted by the wild hill tribes of the interior and the population it had subjugated; hence the defences and fortresses which the conquerors built and rebuilt. Herein is perhaps the greatest distinction between the original Minoan and the derived Mycenæan civilizations. There was a long period through which these Cretan invaders dwelt in Greece, building and rebuilding their palaces and strongholds, and acquiring the vast stores of gold and works of art which testify alike to their taste, their prosperity, and their power. A couple of centuries at least, the sixteenth and fifteenth, the periods called Late Minoan I and II, roughly give the time ascribed to this work. Then, not far from the year 1400, began the inroads from the north which played such havoc with settled Mediterranean civilizations. Crete was overwhelmed by the newcomers. The mainland, however, shows no catastrophic fate such as befell the palace at Knossos.

Leaf has a persuasive picture of what happened. There appear on the northern frontier tribes of warlike adventurers on their way southwards, probably by the same Morava and Vardar valleys of which we have heard so much recently, coming out of the plains of the Danube. They seem to have settled for a time in Epeiros, around Dodona. A quarrel arises between two Minoan chieftains. The weaker calls in to help him a body of the turbulent adventurers. Their work done, the mercenaries have no intention of returning home. A chieftain or two slain, the palaces seized, and a new set of rulers command the land. The ease with which the work was done gives the hint to others. Another Achaian chief ventures as far as Elis, the declining civilization makes a weak resistance, and Pelops has established his kingdom. And so others spread along the coasts and into the river valleys. They did not seize all the country, for they were not numerous enough; Arcadians, Kadmeans, Minyans, Eubœa, Eleusis, Attica, did not come under

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their sway. One dominant caste replaced another; a small number of determined men seized the country, not by any occupation of the whole, involving general destruction and slaughter, but by the mere holding of strategic points and lines of communication.

This theory of a small military caste of Achaians ruling a subject population from their strongholds fits admirably with the picture of the chiefs of the Homeric poems; the multitude plays in them no more glorious rôle than that the aristocratic poet assigns to Thersites. It explains as well the fact that the invaders left no permanent mark on the art of the country; they simply annexed the civilization they had conquered by the strong arm.

The picture of the lordly religion of the conquerors, of the horde they held though so few in numbers, the explanation of the divergence of the picture given in the Catalogue from the rest of the Iliad, the story of the strong central government at Mycene, the dominion of Odysseus and relations with the west, the thrust towards the east, the fusion of races, the story of the composition of the epic, with interesting comment on Gilbert Murray's theory of expurgation, all these are treated with such profound knowledge and sane reasoning that the reader is sure to know heroic Greece as he never knew it before.

It is curious that one of the few weak points in Dr. Leaf's knowledge of the country he describes in lectures intended to be delivered in America should be Corinth, which has been so extensively excavated by Americans. The land is not nearly so arid as he thinks; Dr. Rufus Richardson is no longer "head of the American excavators," but has passed to his reward. It can no longer be said that there was no Corinth in existence in Agamemnon's day, and that no Mycenæan remains have ever been found there. Of Dr. Blegen's discovery of Minoan pottery, however, now going on at Corinth despite troublous days in Greece, few even of Americans are yet aware, and Corinth is not an essential part of Dr. Leaf's argument in this truly important book.

AMERICANS FROM ULSTER.

The Scotch-Irish in America. By Henry Jones Ford. Princeton University Press.

If the speculations of Prof. James Heron are correct, "Scotch-Irish" is a geographical rather than ethnic appellative. The Lowland-Scotch, from whom the Ulster Scotch were mostly recruited, seem to have had rather more Germanic than Celtic blood in their veins. For the purposes of history, these speculations are, however, irrelevant. By the time the Scotch-Irish begin to matter they are a distinct type, with physical as well as spiritual characteristics well marked. Their emigration from Ulster to America meant, according to Professor Ford, the coming here of the most vital and energetic ethnic power that operated prior to formation of the American nation. In education, industry, political and religious ideas and institutions the Scotch-Irish exercised a directive and enlivening influence. Forced by the stupid economic policy of Great Britain to flee expropriation and starvation, the Ulster-Scotch began to emigrate to America in groups and families. Through emigration chiefly, their numbers grew from the small community of 140 in 1636 to one-sixth of the entire population of the country in the period of the War of Independence. Their first goal was New England, but the area of their greatest concentration was Pennsylvania, and they were to be found in greater and smaller groups in the Carolinas, Virginia, Kentucky, New York, and on the frontier. They brought with them an enduring resentment against the Government that had maltreated them, and that continued to discriminate against their connections at home in all matters of industry and commerce. They brought with them the ideals and system of the Presbyterians, and they brought with them the notions of education that go therewith. Their religion, as is natural to religion, appears to have been the outstanding and persistent medium of the expression of their common characteristics and the articulation of their group-mind. Similar to their fellow-Americans in speech, background, and environment, their living differences from them, if they got expression at all, got it in the peculiar quality of their religious association and religious doctrine. In those their spontaneous powers were freest and most themselves. They seem to have taken primarily the form of organization, realized, through the efforts of Jonathan Dickinson, in the American Presbyterian Church, which still seems to be dominated and inspired by men of the Scotch-Irish breed.

Professor Ford cites Joseph Galloway, an eminent Philadelphia lawyer, a friend of Benjamin Franklin's, a publicist who found it impossible to go the whole way to independence, as testifying before a committee of the House of Commons that "the underlying cause of the American Revolution was the activity and influence of the Presbyterian interest." That interest, indeed, had no reason for feeling any unity with or any loyalty towards the mother country. He declared that at the beginning of the revolt not one-fifth of the people "had independence in view," and that in the army enlisted by the Continental Congress "there were scarcely one-fourth natives of America—about one-half Irish, the other fourth were English and Scotch." According to Galloway, the whole enterprise of the fathers of our country would hardly have been formidable without the continent-wide organization of the Presbyterian Church, without the activity of Scotch-Irish through the church.

Mr. Ford's narrative stops with the War for Independence. Have the Scotch-Irish since disappeared as a differentiated ethnic faction of our American population? Has the organization which so served to cut off her colonies from England failed to keep together its members and their descendants as a definitive group? Or are the Scotch-Irish, associated together in the form of the Church, still a solidary and persistent ethnic force in the spiritual constitution of the America of our time, whose qualities and achievements as a group can still be recorded and appraised? Who will answer these questions?

AN ENCYCLOPÆDIC MYTHOLOGY.

The Mythology of All Races. Thirteen Volumes. Edited by Louis Herbert Gray, with George Foot Moore as Consulting Editor. Vol. I: Greek and Roman Mythology, by William Sherwood Fox. Boston: Marshall Jones Co. Sold only in sets.

This is a time of coöperative scholarship which produces comprehensive and encyclopædic works in almost every field of human interest. Although there is always a painful suggestion of the Alexandrian Age in these attempts to digest and present in ordered form the sums total of knowledge in particular fields, we cannot deny that there is much advantage in enterprises of this kind, and indeed we may cherish the hope that the encyclopædic works of to-day, which are frequently storehouses of learning, will prove the foundations on which scholarship may further build.

One of the latest of these undertakings is "The Mythology of All Races," the initial volume of which is now before us. The succeeding eleven volumes will present in order the myths of the ancient Teutons, Celts, Slavs, the Finno-Ugric and Siberian peoples, the Semitic stocks, the Indic races and the Persians, the Armenians and the pagan tribes of Africa, the Chinese and the Japanese, the Malayo-Polynesian and Australian peoples, the American Indians, the ancient Egyptians, and the peoples of Burma, Siam, and Annam. The last volume will contain an analytical index of the whole. Scholars from four continents will contribute to the work.

It will at once be recognized that the plan is comprehensive and useful. Although some mythologies have been well treated in English many times, a considerable amount of the material to be here presented has been accessible to scholars alone through foreign works, written in some cases in the less-known tongues. Each contributor has been left free to plan his work and to interpret his material according to his own ideas. Yet certain restrictions have evidently been observed. One is the avowed intention to admit nothing "offensive to pious ears." We are tempted to retort that if any ears are offended by hearing the whole truth concerning the substrata of religion, art, and poetry —for such myths are—so much the worse for the owners of such tender members. Modification and excision may well be practiced in books intended for children, but timidity in a work which pretends to be scientific is past all excusing.

A second limitation is imposed by the fact that the general editor wishes these

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volumes to be useful for both the scholar and the general reader. Undoubtedly the former will learn much from reading in plain narrative form the tales which the imagination of simple man in many parts of the world once invented to account for the mysteries with which he felt himself beset on every side, and the general reader may well be entertained and instructed by the varied matter which will be presented to him. But in the nature of the case both cannot be satisfied, useful as the technical student may find the notes and bibliographies which each volume is to contain. In fact, one cannot avoid the feeling that in reality this undertaking is planned by the publishers for well-to-do readers who will buy the sets complete by subscription. Such fortunate individuals are persons of consequence, who should be instructed by first-rate scholars, but why pretend to ride two horses when to master one is a creditable performance?

In his introduction to the volume with which we are now concerned Professor Fox first discusses briefly some fundamental general questions, such as the nature and the origin of myths, their sanction and persistence; then, passing to his immediate subject, he touches on the nature of Greek religion and the specific character of Greek myths, their meaning, and their relation to ethics and to art. Many scholars will disagree with certain statements in the author's definition of a myth, but in general his views are sound and in accord with those of the best modern scholars.

Concerning the interpretation of myths, Mr. Fox acknowledges his allegiance to the historical and comparative methods in all essential points. Yet, in keeping with the apparent purpose of the publishers, he devotes himself primarily to telling the myths in narrative form; of actual attempts to interpret the classical mythology, there is comparatively little.

The body of the book is divided into three parts: the first contains the myths of the Beginning, the Heroes—arranged for the most part by localities—and the Afterworld; the second part is given to the Greek gods, the stories concerning the Olympians being followed by the tales of the lesser Gods; and the third division is allotted to a brief treatment of the Mythology of Ancient Italy. A full bibliography and an index complete the volume.

Mr. Fox has given us a modern treatment of classical mythology, based on a good knowledge of his material. From his superabundant matter he has, of course, been forced to make a selection; but it is to be regretted that he did not limit his choice more strictly, omitting, for example, his whole discussion of the mythology of Ancient Italy, with the possible exception of the myths relating to the early days of Rome. Of what possible use can the brief paragraph on Abstract Gods (p. 299), or that on Momentary and Departmental Gods (p. 300), be to the uninitiated? Even in the earlier parts a further limitation of choice would have obtained space for a fuller treatment of the most important myths; as the book now is, the reader at times has a sensation of being overcrowded, which interferes with his understanding and enjoyment.

Finally, if books are to be illustrated, the pictures should be placed in immediate relation to the text which they illustrate. In the present volume there are sixty-three full-page plates, well chosen and handsomely reproduced; but less than half are inserted in their proper places. We trust that other volumes will be better planned in this respect.

Notes

"Inside the German Empire," by Herbert Bayard Swope, is announced for publication by the Century Company.

"Human Welfare Work in Chicago" will be published shortly by A. C. McClurg & Co.

Henry Holt & Co. announce the publication of Professor Prokosch's "Deutscher Lehrgang, Erstes Jahr."

A translation of a four-act drama of the Russian Revolution by Sergius Stepniak will be published shortly by the Stratford Company, of Boston.

The following are among Longmans, Green & Co.'s publications for December: "Italy in the War," by Sidney Low; "Tales of the Great War," by Sir Henry Newbolt; "Alfred Lyttleton," by Edith Lyttleton; "Philosophy: An Autobiographical Fragment," by Henrie Waste; "Tokens of the Eighteenth Century Connected with Booksellers and Bookmakers," by W. Longman; "Typographical Printing Surfaces," by Lucien Alphonse Legros and John Cameron Grant; "The Soul and Its Story," by Norman Pearson; "Pilgrimage: Poems," by Eric Shepherd; "Steam Turbines," by William J. Goudie; "Strength of Ships," by Athole J. Murray; "An Introduction to Mine Surveying," by Thomas Bryson; "Tidal Soundings and Diagrams," by W. V. Merrifield; "The Administration of Industrial Enterprises," by Edward D. Jones; "Elements of Military Education," by W. A. Brockington; "State Policy in Irish Education," by T. Corcoran; "Four Lectures on the Handling of Historical Material," by L. F. Rushbrooke Williams; "The Foundations of Indian Economics," by Radhakamal Mukerjee; "Hindu Mind-Training," by an Anglo-Saxon Mother; "The Indian Moral Instruction and Indian Caste Problems," by A. H. Benton.

Prof. Mary Whiton Calkins, of Wellesley College, is lecturer this year in philosophy on the Mills Foundation at the University of California, in succession to Professor Palmer, of Harvard. Her subject is "The Fundamental Problems of Philosophy." She is also conducting a seminary on "The Place of the Self in Psychology and Philosophy."

Under the editorship of Professors Bassett and Fay, Smith College has begun the issue of a series of studies in history, which are to be published quarterly and to contain brief essays in the field of history and government prepared by faculty, alumnæ, students, or friends. The first number presents an "Introduction to the History of Connecticut as a Manufacturing State," and shows by its title the broad interpretation that the editors have given to the term history. Such interpretation is entirely in accord with the best opinions among historical scholars at the present time. Miss Fuller, the writer of the pamphlet, aims to trace the steps whereby Connecticut was transformed from an agricultural to an industrial State, and in so doing is performing a service to the history of the country as valuable as would be a study in a political or constitutional transition—such as from colony to commonwealth or from territory to statehood—and one that must take precedence if we are to understand the true inwardness of the political or constitutional change. Miss Fuller's paper is largely introductory in character and perhaps too statistical to interest many readers, but as a student of the late Prof. Callender, of Yale, she has a clear idea of what she wants to do and of the direction that a more thorough investigation of the subject should take. In fact, she proposes to write the larger work herself at some future time. Should she carry out this promise—one not infrequently made by beginners and too often unfulfilled—she will have made a contribution of real merit to the unwritten history of Connecticut in the nineteenth century. As it is, her conclusion is important that the State remained in large part a rural community through more than half the century, and did not become predominantly manufacturing until the decade from 1870 to 1880. A study of this kind brings out with exceptional clearness the absurdities of the present constitution, now nearly a century old, which guarantees equal representation in the lower house to every town without regard to population. For the "birthplace of American democracy" to grant the same legislative power to a town of 300 people that it does to a great manufacturing city of 130,000 is as strange an anachronism as is that clause of its constitution which provides for amendment without direct appeal to the people.

The color of pioneer life in Indiana is well exhibited in Bayard Rush Hall's "The New Purchase," reprinted for the centennial celebration of Indiana's admission to Statehood by the Princeton University Press ($2 net), with an introduction by James A. Woodburn. Early life in the West has seldom been better described than in this volume by the first principal of Indiana Seminary, the institution of the wilderness that later blossomed into the University of Indiana—a volume first published in 1843, and one which, after running through two editions, had become almost impossible to procure. The "New Purchase" was the large tract east and south of the Wabash obtained by the national Government in 1818, in the centre of which the Seminary was established. To Bloomington, in it, Hall came in 1823, when Indiana had but 150,000 inhabitants, and here he remained for nearly eight years, entering with energy and spirit not only into the tasks of the Seminary, but into all the life of the backwoods. He became a skilled marksman, able to shoot off the head of a prairie chicken at a hundred feet, a good woodchopper and roller of logs, a participant in quilting or husking or other frolics, a spectator at the pioneer camp-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meetings; he clerked, ground bark in a tannery, preached, organized a Presbytery, and travelled extensively. All his experiences he set down under a pseudonym, with a crude but serviceable style, with many faults of taste and narrative design, with a humor often coarse, and with a sometimes tiresome insistence upon detail. But the five hundred pages also contain the life of a people, for they treat in vivid and colorful style the man's own adventures, his acquaintance with Western scenes and characters, the dissensions vexing the Seminary, and general social and cultural conditions: they describe clearly, as Professor Woodburn says, the modes of travel, the roads, the cabin homes and inns, the settlers' hospitality, food and clothing, the games, weddings, barbecues, stump speeches, college "exhibitions," rude charivaris, court trials, and pigeon shootings. The author had an eye both for human nature and for the interesting aspect of indigenous institutions.

The German Government confiscated all copies of Hermann Fernau's book, "Because I Am a German," within three weeks after publication, and forbade all further sales. In Switzerland public sales of the book have been forbidden. The renown thus achieved seems to be the main reason for issuing an English translation (Dutton; $1.00 net). The author treats only the diplomatic origins of the war, and he treats these only in so far as they have already been presented much more ably and fully in the anonymous "J'accuse." He occupies no new point of view and offers no new arguments. He merely reiterates the conclusions of the earlier work and demands from the German Government a reasoned answer to the argument which "J'accuse" advanced many months ago. The chief value of the new book consists in its proof that at least one other German besides the author of "J'accuse" has preserved his intellectual freedom.

"Their True Faith and Allegiance," by Gustavus Ohlinger (Macmillan; 50 cents), is a timely book, unfortunately, because it produces trustworthy evidence of an ugly feature of our national life. German-Americans have often been charged with treason to their oath of allegiance to this country, but the charge has generally fallen flat because it concerned only a single individual, or because it was not substantiated by exact references. Mr. Ohlinger compiles within the compass of 124 small pages a large, well-authenticated number of cases of treasonable utterances, together with a startling list of societies and unions whose declared purpose is to Germanize this country. With little argumentation and a minimum of passion Mr. Ohlinger arrives at the conclusion that this purpose should be checked at once. The check itself he does not suggest. He is fairly content with demonstrating the menace to our national life which he and others see in German-American societies. His book deserves to be read and pondered over by sober-minded, thinking citizens, as it exhibits facts which are at least worthy of serious consideration. It is a pity that the book is bound in sensational red-white-and-blue paper. Much worse taste, however, is displayed by Owen Wister in his virulent mischievous preface to the book.

The bitter experience of an English prisoner of war in this country in the Revolution is described in the account of Sir Archibald Campbell by Mr. A. M. Howe, in the twelfth volume of the "Bostonian Society Publications." Captured in June 1776, he was sent soon after to Concord jail, and his description of his condition in a letter to Sir Wm. Howe is almost unbelievable. Washington, in a communication to Congress, "deplored the unnecessary ill treatment." In May, 1778, he was exchanged for Ethan Allen, and became "a brilliant leader of the British in Georgia." A brief biography of another soldier of the Revolution, Gen. John Thomas, is given by Mr. Arthur Lord. He was in command of the troops which by the occupation of Dorchester Heights caused the evacuation of Boston on March 17, 1776. Later he led the Canadian expedition sent for the relief of Arnold at Quebec, during which he died.

The course of historical research has of late years reduced the importance of the adventurous borderer, Daniel Boone, who was neither first explorer of Kentucky nor first settler in her wilderness. But as a typical pioneer, as builder of the Cumberland Gap road, and as the man who did more than any other to guide colonists to lands in the Southwest and protect them there, he still looms large enough to appeal to the youthful imagination. His life has been well told for the True Stories of Great Americans series (Macmillan; 50 cents each), by Lucille Gulliver, who does not devote so much space to adventures with the Indians but that justice is done to Boone's services to the peaceful building of the West. To the same series Daniel E. Wheeler contributes a volume on Abraham Lincoln, a sound feature of which is that almost half is given to the events following Lincoln's nomination to the Presidency. The prime excellence of the series is that it possesses maturity of tone.

Mr. Earl G. Swem's "Bibliography of Virginia, Part I," fills the belated *Bulletin* of the Virginia State Library for April-October, 1915. This bibliography is made up of more than 6,710 entries of books and pamphlets, magazine articles, excerpts, and other printed or manuscript material, not including official publications, which are in the State Library. The compiler estimates that this number is rather more than one-third of the total number that might properly be included under his heading. Many of the two-thirds of additional titles will undoubtedly find their way into the State collection as a result of the publication of this list, and thereby justify the expenditure on it just in proportion as they lessen its value as a catalogue of the Library. The succeeding parts of the publication will presumably be made up chiefly of these future acquisitions, and of the official publications now omitted. This catalogue, which can never be a bibliography in any proper use of that term, is a useful illustration of the ease with which a collection on a subject of this sort can be developed to portentous dimensions. Its comprehensiveness makes the estimate of its relative completeness seem courageous, for the possibilities of inclusions are well-nigh infinite. Of the thirty-eight entries under George Washington, thirteen are supplied by the Old South Leaflets, Williston's "Eloquence" and "Modern Eloquence." These are all Washington's own writings. The index, which seems to have been carefully prepared and which abounds in subject-headings, refers to some 200 other entries. One of these is the only entry under the name of the Republican party, which would have been unrecognized if the Central Committees of New York city and county had not printed the speeches delivered at a Union Festival, February 22, 1862, in commemoration of Washington's birth. The State Library at Richmond deserves much praise for its efforts to collect Virginia and Virginian publications, but this printed catalogue largely conceals the real value of its possessions.

Democracy is the ability to recognize values objectively, to see that the pleasures and pains of one's neighbor are as real as one's own, and so to work for liberty, equality, and fraternity (the nexus of ideas is not perfectly clear so soon as we step out of the region of ideals); the Americans are an idealistic people, especially in their international relations (but their idealism ought to lead them to sympathize actively with the Allies in the present war); war is hell (a saying we have heard before), and is incited by a false idea of the state as an entity having an interest apart from the interests of its citizens; peace is most desirable and may be obtained by better education, the League to Enforce Peace, and discontinuance of armaments—these are the ideas that find expression in Prof. J. B. Pratt's four essays in the volume entitled "Democracy and Peace" (Badger; $1 net). They are not very novel, and some of the details of their elaboration are questionable, but they are well put and have an earnest ring.

Emile Verhaeren, the Belgian poet, was killed on November 27, while boarding a train at Rouen, France. He was born at Saint-Amand, near Antwerp, on May 21, 1855. He attended a school in Ghent, and later studied at Louvain, where, with the opera singer Van Dyck, he issued a journal. This was quickly suppressed by the university authorities, and was followed by *Le Type*, in which Verhaeren was associated with Max Waller, Iwan Gilkin, and Albert Giraud, but which fared no better. He was admitted to the bar in Brussels in 1881, but soon found the law too unimaginative for a man of his temperament, and devoted his whole attention to literature, and especially to the spirit of "young Belgium" as examplified in *La Jeune Belgique* and *L'Art Moderne*. At this time he took great interest in the impressionistic school of art, which was just then making itself felt upon the Continent. In his early works, "Les Flamandes" (1883) and "Les Moines" (1886), he showed a robustness and strength verging at times on violence. "Les Soirs" (1887) and other works of that period marked a reaction in his style. From applying his pictorial method to psychological studies, he passed to the task of individualizing the towns and fields of his native country. In "Villages illusoires" he describes the tragedy of the fields and farms deserted by the people in the race for the town and industrial centres. Later volumes of poems are "Les Heures claires" (1896), "Les Visages de la vie" (1899), "Les Petites Légendes" (1900), "Les Forces tumultueuses" (1901), and "Les Tendresses premières" (1904). In 1898 he wrote a lyric drama, "Les Aubes," in 1900 a four-act play, "Le Cloître," represented both in Brussels and in Paris, and in 1901 an historical drama, "Philippe II."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance

INCIDENTS OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCE.

In some ways the most spectacular incident, this past week, was the fall of nearly 2 cents for 4 marks in German exchange, and of ¼ cent on each Austrian crown; the rates thus reached being much the lowest of this war to date, and having been touched in the face of the victories in Rumania. Berlin exchange went to 65⅞ cents, Austrian exchange to 11.52; and since the normal par of exchange on Berlin is 95.2 cents and on Vienna 20.3, it follows that the German rate is now depreciated 30¾ per cent. and the Austrian rate 43 per cent. This compares with a maximum depreciation in Russian exchange of 42⅝ per cent., which was reached last month; of French exchange 17⅝ per cent., last April. Exchange on London fell in September, 1915, to a discount of nearly 8 per cent., but it now stands only about 2¼ per cent. below parity.

No doubt the persistent fall in the Teutonic exchanges—which has been very rapid during 1916—is partly caused by an unseen balance of actual financial or commercial drafts. Yet the movement again recalls the famous "Bullion Committee's" report to Parliament in 1809, on the 20 per cent. depreciation of London exchange in neutral continental markets. That decline, the Committee reported, may have occurred originally "in consequence of the measures of the enemy"—Napoleon's Continental embargo against English trade. But the Bank of England had suspended gold payments when that war began, and the Committee frankly ascribed the later condition of exchange "to the circumstance of the paper of England not being redeemable in cash." The case of Germany presents in all respects a close analogy.

The incident of the offer of foreign Treasury bills for discount by our bankers was closed last Friday, by withdrawal of the tender, on the part of the French and English Finance Ministers, in deference to the objection of our Federal Reserve Board. Whose was the blunder, if it should so be regarded, in announcing the offer of the foreign Treasury bills without in any way specifying its limitations and evidently without having satisfied the supervisory banking authorities in advance, it would perhaps be useless to inquire. From the point of view of international finance, there was considerable logic and precedent in a proposal for the discounting of short-time notes against foreign Governments' purchases of merchandise. There is nothing new in the acceptance of such exchequer bills by banks of another country.

But the surrounding circumstances in this case were at least unusual. Absence even of a generally specified limit to the contemplated issue was the mistake of the procedure—not because of the standing of the borrower, but because of the possible position of the lenders. The self-restraint of American banks, taken as a whole, did not stand the test of 1901 and 1905, and it is undoubtedly quite as well that an authoritative hand should this time have made itself felt in the way of regulation. Nothing is more probable than that our banks in the future, if the American market retains all or part of its present functions as the central money market of the world, will deal as freely in foreign Treasury bills as in foreign stocks and bonds. But the entry upon such novel functions may probably best be undertaken gradually and slowly, and with a clearer view of the financial outlook.

With the American investing community, outside of the banks, the case is not quite identical. The Reserve Board is unquestionably right in repudiating the foolish notion that this country is bound to be ruined by the incoming tide of gold. The potential danger of inflated credit and inflated speculation, because of suddenly increased bank reserves, always exists when the United States has the whiphand of the international markets; but that is absolutely no excuse for the childish talk that has been indulged in. On the other hand, however, every clear-sighted economist must admit that the building up of a mountain of gold at home in exchange for an overflowing merchandise export trade is not a rational or sensible preparation for our financial future.

Redemption of foreign holdings of our own securities is a proper and normal recourse in our present position of international power and prestige. It places the United States in the position of an individual suddenly favored by financial fortune, who chooses to pay off his debts with his new profits. But from the very first of this phenomenal economic windfall of the past two years, thoughtful American financiers have recognized also that the circumstances devolved a further economic duty on our markets.

Under all of the circumstances, we were virtually bound to invest as a market in the sound securities of the outside world, possession of which would regulate international exchange, insure an income for the future, and guarantee our position on the world's markets. That the movement will continue, is from an economic point of view a virtual certainty. In precisely what form and on precisely what terms any further loans will be placed, is no doubt debatable.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

FICTION.

Checkhov, A. The Duel, and Other Stories. Translated by C. Garnett. Macmillan. $1.50 net.
Gundelfinger, G. F. The New Fraternity. Privately printed.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Ball, C. J. Shumer and Shem. Some Philological Coincidences and Sequences. Oxford University Press.
Esenwein, J. B. Writing for the Magazines. Springfield, Mass.: Home Correspondence School. $1.50.
Leacock, S. Further Foolishness. Lane. $1.25 net.
Lindsay, V. A Handy Guide for Beggars. Macmillan. $1.25 net.
Moxcey, M. E. Girlhood and Character. Abingdon Press. $1.50 net.
Muir, J. A Thousand-Mile Walk to the Gulf. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50 net.
New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray, H. Bradley, W. A. Craigie, and C. T. Onions. Vol. X—Ti—Z. V—Verificative. Oxford University Press. $1.25.
Old Tavern Signs. An Excursion in the History of Hospitality, by F. Endell. Houghton Mifflin. $5 net.

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

Bible Stories to Read and Tell. Selected and arranged by Frances J. Olcott. Houghton Mifflin. $2 net.
Bizzell, W. B. The Social Teachings of the Jewish Prophets. Sherman, French. $1.25 net.
Burton, M. Le R. On Being Divine. Pilgrim Press. 50 cents net.
Husband, R. W. The Prosecution of Jesus. Princeton Univ. Press. $1.50 net.
Neogi, D. N. Sacred Tales of India. Macmillan.
Smith, G. B. A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion. Univ. of Chicago Press. $3 net.

GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS.

Alba, D. S. Un programa económico y financiero. Madrid: Sobrinos de la Sucesora de M. Minuesa de Los Rios.
Duchesne, A. E. Democracy and Empire. Oxford Univ. Press. 2s. 6d. net.
Girault, A. The Colonial Tariff Policy of France. Edited by C. Gide. Oxford University Press. $2.50.
Hobson, J. A. The New Protectionism. Putnam. $1.
Tarbell, I. M. New Ideals in Business. Macmillan. $1.75 net.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Bracq, J. C. The Provocation of France. Oxford Univ. Press. $1.25.
Newbolt, H. Tales of the Great War. Longmans, Green. $1.75 net.
Rice, R. A. Stevenson: How to Know Him. Bobbs-Merrill.
Rideing, W. H. Washington (True Stories of Great Americans). Macmillan. 50 cents.

SCIENCE.

Gamble, E. B. The Sexes in Science and History. Putnam. $1.50 net.
Joyce, T. A. Central American and West Indian Archæology. Putnam. $3.75 net.
Moon, F. F. The Book of Forestry. Appleton. $1.75 net.
Wilcox, E. V. Tropical Agriculture. Appleton. $2.50 net.
Winslow, K. The Prevention of Disease. Phila.: Saunders. $1.75 net.

DRAMA AND MUSIC.

Kaye-Smith, S. John Galsworthy. London: Nisbet & Co.
Taft, G. E. Chimalman. New York: The Cameo Press.
Wickes, E. M. Writing the Popular Song. Springfield, Mass.: Home Correspondence School.

JUVENILE.

Hunt, C. W. About Harriet. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25 net.
Seton, E. T. The Woodcraft Manual for Girls. Doubleday, Page.

TEXTBOOKS.

Angus, F. R. Fundamentals of French. Holt.
Boynton, F. D. School Civics. Boston: Ginn.
Finney, H. A., and Brown, J. C. Modern Business Arithmetic Complete Course. Holt.
Gager, C. S. A Laboratory Guide for General Botany. Phila.: Blakiston. 90 cents net.
Gerstäcker, F. Germelshausen. Edited by O. F. Lewis. Heath. 35 cents.
Hillern, W. V. Höher als die Kirche. Edited by S. W. Clary. Heath. 35 cents.
Hudson, W. H. An Outline History of English Literature. London: Bell & Sons. 2s. 6d. net.
Miller, W. J. An Introduction to Historical Geology. Van Nostrand. $2 net.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Richard Burton's
BERNARD SHAW
THE MAN AND THE MASK

By the author of "HOW TO SEE A PLAY," etc. $1.50 *net.*

While aiming to give information about each of the plays and about Shaw's methods to those who know little about him, the author hopes he may also furnish even the perfect Shavians with new viewpoints on their idol.

Henry Holt & Co., 34 W. 33d St. New York

CERTAIN questions vital to human welfare must be answered by every nation. To be answered they must be understood. To be understood they must be investigated.

READINGS IN SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Edited by ALBERT B. WOLFE

$2.80

presents the opinions and findings of trained specialists and brilliant analysts upon many of these questions of to-day. Thinking men and women will recognize the stamp of sincerity upon them. The volume provides an abundance of fresh, original and inspiring material for students in economics and sociology.

GINN AND COMPANY — BOSTON, NEW YORK, CHICAGO, LONDON

A THOUSAND MILE WALK TO THE GULF

By JOHN MUIR.

The journal of Muir's tramp to Florida in 1867, of his trip thence to Cuba and finally to California via Panama, edited by Prof. William F. Badè. Illustrated, $2.50 net. HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO., BOSTON.

THE POSSIBLE PEACE

By ROLAND HUGINS

An illuminating discussion of the possibilities of a permanent peace after the world war.

Price $1.25 net

THE CENTURY CO. New York

Schools

The Tome School

An Endowed Preparatory School

Illustrated Book on Request

THOMAS STOCKHAM BAKER, Ph.D., Port Deposit, Md.

The Half Century Old "Catholic World"

A monthly magazine of general literature and science.

A very interesting Christmas present is a year's subscription to the Catholic World.

Some of the titles of the December Table of Contents.

THE RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION, *by Frank O'Hara.*
OLD WINE AND NEW BOTTLES, *John Ayscough*
DR. JOHN B. MURPHY, *by James J. Walsh.*
WAS THE SON OF MAN BRUSQUE TO HIS MOTHER? *Edmund T. Shanahan.*
NEW BOOKS, RECENT EVENTS, WITH OUR READERS.

Subscription price—$3.00 per year
Single Copy—25c

Sample copy sent free on request

THE CATHOLIC WORLD
120 West 60th Street, New York City

From Putnam's List

Send for our 48-page Illustrated Holiday Catalogue

Reminiscences of a War Time Statesman and Diplomat
1830-1915
By Frederick W. Seward
Assistant Secretary of State under
Lincoln, Johnson and Hayes

8°. 500 *pages.* **$3.50** *net.*

The son of William Henry Seward, Secretary of State under Lincoln, Mr. Seward had a remarkably interesting and distinguished career. He was sent to warn Lincoln of the plot to assassinate him in 1861. He was Assistant Secretary of State for twelve years. He was nearly murdered in his father's defense April 14, 1865, and later participated in many events of national importance.

From the Press

"So completely filled with matter of the most intense interest to every live American, that the reviewer has the utmost difficulty in deciding what to refer to."—*Brooklyn Eagle.*

"Far more fascinating than a novel, this lively volume, richer too in the quality called atmosphere and in suggestive inspiration. The kind of book that may be read over and over, reopened anywhere."—*Chicago Herald.*

"An interesting volume of *real* recollections, the very index of which reads like a roster of great deeds and great names."—*Phila. North American.*

On the Art of Writing
Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch

8°. **$1.50.**

"If the author had written nothing but the one chapter on 'Jargon,' the book would be well worth reading."—*Phila. Telegraph.*

The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World
Edgar J. Banks
Author of "Bismya," etc.
12°. 33 Illustrations. **$1.50.**

The author skilfully describes the "Seven Wonders," placing them in their proper historical setting and sketching the times and conditions which produced them.

Father Payne
A. C. Benson
12°. **$1.50.**

Random and altogether delightful reflections on men and manners. Suggestive, entertaining, and, above all, human.

Old Christmas
Washington Irving

8°. 23 Illustrations. Some in Color. **$2.50.**

This delightful and glowing picture is here presented for the first time in fitting Christmas guise. A charming gift book.

And Thus He Came
Cyrus Townsend Brady

12°. 6 Illustrations in Color. **$1.00.**
A Christmas fantasy.

Prices Net. At All Booksellers.

G. P. Putnam's Sons

New York 2 West 45th St. — **London** 24 Bedford St.

THE BOOK YOU NEED

The Book Everybody Endorses

Learn to Figure Faster

The demands of the day require it of everyone. This is an age of short-cuts.

The greatest short-cut of any age, the Panama Canal, could not have been completed on time if other short-cuts had not been used in working it out. Labor-saving devices are found on every hand to-day. The successful manufacturer does not hesitate to discard a machine be it ever so new for one that will do the work quicker, cheaper, better.

Everybody uses Arithmetic. Learn the latest and best. It saves time, labor, worry. Don't depend upon a piece of paper or machine to do your figuring when it can be done easier, cheaper, quicker, better, by the new, simple, short-cut methods of the Prewett System, explained in **"HOW TO FIGURE FAST."** Every one likes it and most people need it every day in business regardless of age or vocation. Get out of the rut. Cut out the brain-fagging, nerve-trying, old way of figuring and free yourself forever from the drudgery of cumbersome calculations by learning **"How to Figure Fast."** You will agree with F. M. Marshall, Expert Accountant, who says: "It is the best thing I ever saw." Professor McCallum, Teacher of Mathematics: "It is a grand work and I want every teacher under me to have one." Thousands of others endorse this little book like G. J. Felix, of Connecticut, who says: "Best book I ever had. Am thoroughly satisfied." The Gulf Coast Lumberman says: "It is the marvel of the age." There are 60 pages of boiled down printed matter with embossed leatherette cover in convenient form for pocket, office or home, sent anywhere upon receipt of $1—or by parcel post c. o. d., for $1.10. That Dollar will do you more real good personally than $100 spent in many other ways. Get your order in the mail to-day and make us both glad thereafter. Circular full of strong testimonials free. Money back if not as represented. Address

E. C. ROBERTSON
General Salesman
1408 Prairie Avenue, Houston, Texas

THE TESTAMENT OF WILLIAM WINDUNE

AND OTHER POEMS

By J. H. WALLIS

"Mr. Wallis has struck in this volume a note, envisaged a substance, so finely shaped and tuned to the scrupulous orderliness of thought and form, that its importance will be seriously acknowledged by the truly discriminating students of contemporary poetry."—*William Stanley Braithwaite in the Boston Transcript.*

$1.00 *net, postpaid.*

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

209 Elm Street, New Haven, Conn. — 280 Madison Ave., New York City

---

Now Ready

A Dictionary of Similes

By FRANK J. WILSTACH

This much-needed 529-page book contains over 15,000 similes from all languages under 3,400 subject headings

Price in cloth $2.50

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers, Boston

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED